PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

PROPERTY OF THE LIBRARY OF THE MAR 1930 North Carolina College for WOMEN

Number 27 **1929**

Geography in its Relation to the Other Social Sciences	*Isaiah Bowman*
Present-Day Democracy and Its Critics	*Samuel E. Forman*
Teaching Economics as a Social Science	*Leverett S. Lyon*
The New Biography	*Richard J. Purcell*
German versus Polish Nationalism	*Mary E. Townsend*

MEETINGS

WASHINGTON ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

Number 27 **1929**

Geography in its Relation to the Other Social Sciences	*Isaiah Bowman*
Present-Day Democracy and Its Critics	*Samuel E. Forman*
Teaching Economics as a Social Science	*Leverett S. Lyon*
The New Biography	*Richard J. Purcell*
German versus Polish Nationalism	*Mary E. Townsend*

MEETINGS

WASHINGTON ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

CONTENTS

		Page
Washington Meeting, April 12–13, 1929		1
I.	Aims in Teaching the Social Studies, *Mr. George J. Jones*	2
II.	Development of the Constitution Since 1887, *Mr. Edward S. Noyes*	9
III.	Teaching Economics as a Practical Social Science, *Dr. Leverett S. Lyon*	20
IV.	Address of Greeting, *Dr. Frank W. Ballou*	30
V.	The New Biography, *Professor Richard J. Purcell*	33
VI.	Present-Day Democracy and Its Critics, *Dr. Samuel E. Forman*	41
VII.	Present Trend of Social Studies, *Professor A. C. Krey*	48
VIII.	The Fall of the Liberal Party, *Professor Witt Bowden*	55
IX.	Summary of Father Walsh's Address on Soviet Russia and the United States	65
Atlantic City Meeting, November 30, 1929		69
X.	The Post-War Drift of Pan-Americanism, *Professor Irving S. Kull*	70
XI.	German vs. Polish Nationalism—A Question of Treaty Revision, *Professor Mary E. Townsend*	89
XII.	Geography in Relation to the Social Studies, *Dr. Isaiah Bowman*	105
XIII.	Treasurer's Report for 1928-1929	118
XIV.	Report of Membership	119
XV.	Constitution	120
XVI.	Subscribing Libraries	122
XVII.	List of Council Members	124
XVIII.	List of Members	125

WASHINGTON MEETING

April 12-13, 1929

Friday Afternoon, April 12, 3:30 o'clock, The Auditorium, J. O. Wilson Normal School, Washington, D. C.

GENERAL TOPIC—*"Aims in Teaching Social Sciences"*

a. *"Re-Statement of the Aims in Teaching the Social Studies"* Mr. George J. Jones, Head of the Department of History, Junior and Senior High Schools, Washington

b. *"The Development of the Constitution since 1787,"* Mr. Edward S. Noyes, Central High School, Washington

c. *"Teaching Economics as a Practical Social Science,"* Dr. Leverett S. Lyon, Brooking Institute of Washington

Friday Evening, April 12, 7:00 o'clock, Roof Garden Dining Room, Washington Hotel

GREETING: Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools of Washington

ADDRESSES:

a. *"The New Biography,"* Professor Richard J. Purcell, Catholic University

b. *"Present Day Democracy and its Critics,"* Dr. Samuel E. Forman, Washington

Saturday Morning, April 13, 10:30 o'clock, Catholic University

ADDRESSES:

a. *"Present Trend of Social Studies,"* Professor A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota

b. *"The Fall of the Liberal Party,"* Professor Witt Bowden, University of Pennsylvania

Saturday Afternoon ,1:00 o'clock

ADDRESS:

a. Summary of *"Soviet Russia and the United States"*, Father Edmund A. Walsh, Regent of the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

AIMS IN TEACHING THE SOCIAL STUDIES

The claims made by educators as to the aims in teaching the social sciences have been many. Are some of these the aims of the idealist, impossible to realize? Are we at present succeeding in our purposes as stated in our aims? If not, is it possible to achieve all these aims? One of the studies of the Krey Committee of the American Historical Association is to find evidence to prove that we actually accomplish our aims. This proof is most difficult to obtain, as the fruition of our work continues in life after school days have passed.

It is my purpose today to try to analyze some of the listed aims in teaching the social sciences, with a view of approximating their real value. The general aim, of course, as so often stated is to make boys and girls better citizens, but this is an aim of all teaching in both the grades and the high schools. The public, generally, has confidence in the schools. The liberal and in some cases even lavish expenditures for public school education, give evidence that the people of this country believe that the schools are direct agencies in making their children better citizens.

Do the social studies offer better opportunities to train children for citizenship than other subjects? Have social science teachers a unique and unmatched field for citizenship training? Our able educators in social science have answered these questions strongly in the affirmative. However, if these extraordinary claims are not and cannot in fact be achieved, would it not be better to admit, as do teachers of certain other subjects, that our fundamental aim is to make boys and girls better citizens by teaching merely content and by developing power? This would make necessary a very detailed course of study, listing both the facts to be taught and the power questions to be pondered, discussed or debated. Such a surrender in our field of work would be comparable to the surrender of the French in America in 1763, in which they lost a vast domain of land containing unsurpassed resources. They retained only two small islands useful for very limited purposes.

Assuming for a moment, that our aims are merely to teach facts

and to develop power, let us note how little we will accomplish if we should surrender what we can call our idealistic aims. In this country the practice whereby social science teachers *day after day* conduct question and answer recitations is more general than many people suspect,—long questions by the teacher, calling for brief statements of facts by the pupils, with little or no differentiation between the momentous and the trifling facts. In pursuing daily this method of fact teaching, some teachers become so expert, that they score the high average of sixty questions in thirty minutes.

Knowledge of the important facts in the history of man leads to better citizenship, as it has a distinct cultural value. Some pertinent questions, however, might be asked.— How many of the hundreds of facts considered important in class room teaching do students remember ten years later? How many of these same facts would the teachers, themselves, know if they taught mathematics instead of history for a period of ten years? After the lapse of a decade, our students retain only a very general impression of the span of history covered in our different courses. In courses, other than American history, I doubt if students retain permanently more than a dozen facts. A student, who has covered in his studies, the broad fields of Ancient, Medieval and Modern history retains little that is permanent other than general pictures of the important periods in which the world stands out as something "dynamic and constantly changing." To this extent we are successful, as culture helps to make good citizenship.

What do we mean by developing power? In the social sciences, this expression has a broader meaning than in other subjects. At this point in the discussion we shall consider it only in its narrower meaning,—power to think clearly and to think straight. This is the important aim of teachers of other subjects, such as mathematics. We claim that the social sciences equal any other subject in their possibilities for developing clear and straight thinking. Problem or thought questions demand careful consideration, particularly the weighing of facts and conditions, and call for conclusions which must be substantiated, as teachers generally ask students "why" for the answer given. We have evidence every day we teach that pupils develop "historical power" in

thinking; that their power of thinking clearly in the realm of the social sciences constantly increases. The advocates of Formal Discipline say that this power of clear and straight thinking is transferred to other lines of thought, but this is a mooted subject. —The all important question, which I will state here, is left for discussion at a later point in this paper.—Can social science teachers develop the power of right thinking and right acting in addition to straight thinking? The average thinking ability of the residents of our penitentiaries equals the average thinking power of people at large, and criminals who have thought the straightest are averaged in with us outsiders. They have never been detected, as their thought was so straight, that they made no slips and left no trails.

Thus, the social sciences, like other subjects make good citizens by giving culture and by teaching clear thinking. Like the French who still hold the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon as centers of their western Atlantic fishing industry, we still hold without question our strongholds of culture and power. Are we to surrender the other aims?—All of these aims, I believe, may be classified under the heading: ''Character building with a carry-over into all walks of life''. This, indeed, would be like the French surrender in 1763 in which they gave up their claims to the wide stretches of Canada and the unsurpassed valley of the Mississippi.

However, if we accept the radical doctrine of some psychologists we must discard all claims for character training. These psychologists say that a child's character is determined by heredity and by his first five year's environment, so that when he reaches school age his bent for either good or bad is so fixed and set, that it is adamant. Few thinkers, however, give this new and hopeless doctrine really serious consideration; they believe that it is just one more psychological chameleonic notion, which in less than five years will be regarded by the radical psychologists, themselves, as psychological heresy. We can all, individually, get overwhelming evidence that our own characters have been influenced by teachers long after the age of five. This evidence can assume no materialistic form. In fact, we must each get this evidence for ourselves, by thinking back into our own lives, reviewing the influences which have made us what we are. Character building,

it would seem, should be the chief aim of all social science teachers. —The social sciences have the center of the field for this kind of work. Other subjects, particularly English, have opportunities for character building, but they occupy the seats in the grand stand on the side lines or in the bleachers.

Faith in Man and in Our Government

Didactic preaching should not be the method used in reaching the aims,—right thinking and character building. Thoughtful students often give to the class the very conclusion we seek. If this does not occur skilful questioning by the teacher may lead to discussions in which the pupils will discover as from themselves, the point the teacher has in mind. The pages of history, it is true, reveal many setbacks in the progress of mankind, yet nothing stands out more clearly in these pages, than that in these ebbs and tides of progress, the tides have constantly reached higher levels. The course in World History, ancient, medieval, and modern, should give pupils evidence of this progress and should also give them faith that the future achievements of man will reach heights far above our present vision.

Students in junior and senior high schools should acquire both an understanding of and a faith in our republican institutions. The great men who established our form of government had faith in its success. How much greater our faith should be in the government we have today, after nearly one hundred fifty years of successful operation. This does not mean the worship of the Constitution as something perfect. Students should realize that the imperfections in the Constitution and in our government should be remedied. They should know that the best way to safeguard our institutions is to be awake to their defects which can be corrected through alert participation in government by intelligent voters. Nor does this mean teaching abstract patriotism. The plain truth in American history is adequate to inspire respect and love for our country. This truth will also promote a willingness to serve. Respect and love together with willingness to serve a country constitute patriotism.

The republican institutions came to us and have been secured for us at a great cost. We accept our liberties very much as a

matter of course in the same unthinking and unquestioning spirit in which we enjoy the sunshine and the air. The rights other men struggled to obtain and paid for in sacrifice are now our heritage. There is always the danger that we may not fully appreciate our liberties. This government we have is ours to keep and preserve. It is the special duty of social science teachers to inspire pupils with faith in this government and also to instill in their minds that participation in government is a duty as well as a right; that a republican form of government succeeds only through an active and intelligent electorate.

The Importance of Biography in Character Building

The social sciences, through the study of biographies, offer opportunities for character building, which are not to be found in teaching other subjects. It is true that biographies are to a small extent studied in other subjects, even in the natural sciences. "A natural science teacher, however, immediately becomes a social science teacher when a biography becomes the topic for class discussion. We should not regard this is an invasion on our rights as we need all the help we can get."

History is to a large extent a chronicle of the achievements of the great leaders in the various fields of progress. It is possible to write the history of any nation as a continuous narrative by selecting large period topics and directing attention to the work of important characters of the period, or of the movement. Textbooks based on the axiom that children are interested in personalities and not in institutions may be the ultimate solution of the textbook problem in all grades of the junior high school. In textbooks of this kind the biographies should include "personal touches" to interest the children in the man or woman, yet an important purpose should be to reveal what each character contributed to civilization. Thus biography creates interest, which is essential for success in teaching.

Biography is an admirable means of character building for junior high school pupils. Who knows what reverie passes through the minds of these children when the class discusses the statemanship of William Pitt, the courage of Kosciusko, the perseverance of George Stephenson, the religious zeal of David Livingstone, the self-sacrifice of Florence Nightingale or the humanitarianism

of Louis Pasteur? Many youngsters revere the qualities that made these historic characters great. Who knows the extent to which they may aspire to be like them when they grow up?—Shaping ideals of conduct is character building which has a wonderful "carry over into all walks of life".

Controversial Questions Should Make Pupils Fairminded

Teachers of social science have a daily opportunity, not found in other subjects, to develop in their pupils the quality of open-mindedness. This means the power of tolerance for the opinions and views of others; a willingness to consider without prejudice all sides of social, economic and political questions. This, indeed, is the unique and unmatched field for teaching fair-thinking as well as straight-thinking. In class discussion of controversial questions fair-thinking will not be developed in the pupils unless the teacher, herself, is impartial. This is a most difficult job, particularly in the case of a forceful teacher. We should always remember, however, that there are millions of capable and sincere citizens who have views on these controversial questions just contrary to our own. Really, who knows which view is right on a controversial question? Students should be permitted to reach their own conclusions after a fair discussion.

The power gained in clear, logical thinking in history may not be transferred to other subjects, but the power developed in right-thinking through fair and unprejudiced discussion of controvesial questions is transferable. Right-thinking leads to right acting and the two together make character.

Dr. Edwin C. Broome, chairman of a committee of the N. E. A., which investigated propaganda in schools, stated: "It is the unanimous conviction of the committee that the function of the school is to teach children how to think, not what to think. The schools belong to all the people and exist to serve all the children. It is not right to indoctrinate the minds of young people with either one side or the other side of controversial questions."

Teaching the necessity of obedience to law, however, is not propaganda. There is nothing more vital in the theory of our republican form of government than the principle that laws must be obeyed, yet that the people retain the right to repeal or modify unsatisfactory laws.

The Teacher Should Have Faith in Her Work.

Teachers of social science like teachers of other subjects have as their aims culture and clear thinking. In addition to these, more than in any other subject, they have as a most important aim the development of character. "Do teachers of social science need special qualifications which are not needed in teaching other subjects?" "Are superior teachers in the social sciences born and not made?" These are questions which cannot be completely answered at the present time. However, I can say, that in my experience, I have known teachers who seemed to be born for the sole purpose of teaching social science. I have also known some cases where teachers, who were crude at first, developed into superior social science teachers.

A successful teacher in character building needs not only the general qualifications of superior teachers in other subjects, but in addition to this, she must believe in the importance of her work and have faith that her pupils are better boys and girls because they have been in her classes. Teaching culture and developing power are in themselves accomplishments. In addition to this, a faith in ourselves, a realization that we are helping some children along the road of right living should be a constant help and inspiration for all of us.

George J. Jones

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION SINCE 1787

I. The Nature of the Constitution

Because the constitution of the United States is a definite formal document, most pupils and some teachers, look upon it as a complete, finished product of 1787,—something to be learned, like the third declension in Latin.

A large part of the problem for the teacher of American History and government in high schools is to displace this notion that the constitution is merely a formal, unchanging combination of words and to substitute the idea of a changing, growing constitution. This means to change from the verbal study of a document that is a legal, theoretical point of view of constitutional law, to the consideration of the actual historical development of government, suggested by the phrase, constitutional history.

The teacher should point out to pupils that there has been a fundamental change in point of view as to the nature of our government and of the relation of the states to the United States by having them compare the closing paragraph of the Declaration of Independence—"are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states", and Article III of the Articles of Confederation,—"The said states hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other," with the preamble of the Constitution,—"We, the people of the United States". But does Article VII of the Constitution fall back to the earlier point of view? It provides that,—"The ratification of the conventions of nine states shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the states so ratifying the same". In contrast with this uncertainty, call the pupils' attention to their habitual, unquestioned use of the phrase "The United States *is*" rather than the Declaration of Independence formula, "these United States". That the relation of the states to the government of the United States has changed is evident. The problem is to show how the change came about. It can be done by emphasizing a few of the most important steps in this development.

II. Adding A Bill of Rights.—The First Ten Amendments

In order to understand much of the original criticism of the Constitution, and a large part of the opposition to its ratification by the states in 1788 and 1789, teachers should remind each class that, as submitted by the Convention of 1787, the Constitution consisted of seven articles: Art. I, The Congress; Art. II, The President; Art. III, The Courts; Art. V, Amendments; Art. VII, Ratification. The other two parts, Arts. IV and VI contained the more or less miscellaneous provisions within which many of the students' "lost clauses" are likely to be located.

What was to become of those "immemorable rights" of Englishmen of which every American state paper had been so full, from the time of the Stamp Act Congress to the time of the Second Continental Congress ? The fragmentary provisions protecting these rights in Art. I and in Art. III did not completely satisfy a great many, even among those who favored the Constitution. Every class should study the first ten amendments, to see how our so-called Bill of Rights, supplied the omissions and removed all uncertainty by definitely forbidding the government of the United States to infringe upon these "immemorable rights". It would be worth while to ask some bright pupils to search for an explanation of the difference between the first eight amendments and the ninth and tenth.

III. Starting the New Government.—The Work of the First Congress.

Point out that the Constitution was only a plan for a government submitted by the Convention to the states for their consideration. Show that questions as to how it would work aroused great interest, and caused so much discussion that Hamilton, Madison and Jay published the Federalist Papers explaining how the proposed government would actually operate. It will be a new idea to many pupils to learn that after ratification was accomplished and the first elections held, it still devolved upon the first Congress to carry out the plan set forth in the Constitution and actually to provide for the government it outlined.

In creating the machinery of the executive department, show how little the first Congress found for a guide in the Constitution. Have the pupils read Art II noting Sec. 1,—"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States". Yet, in

Sec. 2, of Art .II, it seems to take executive departments for granted. Call attention to the previously existing executive organization under the Articles of Confederation, and note that there was still in existence three departments:

1. Department of Foreign Affairs, embodied in John Jay.
2. Board of the Treasury, consisting of three men, with a William Duer as Secretary. This Board did little except to keep account of money owed to the government.
3. War Department under Henry Knox, a former commander in the Revolution.

Raise the question: Should Congress in creating executive departments provide for committees or "Secretaries" as the head of each? In discussing the actual legislation, point out that a single head was provided for the State Department and for the War Department. Show, however, that financial responsibility was divided between a Secretary to be the political head of the finances, a Treasurer to have actual custody of the funds, and a Comptroller to keep records of expenditures. Each of these officers, appointed by the President, was to be independent of the others, thus to insure protection against dishonesty. Point out that the offices, Attorney General and Postmaster General were soon created, although the men appointed to these positions were not at first considered Department Heads. This will suggest the beginning of the increase in the number of Executive Departments. Have some pupil look up the early history of the Post Office Department. Ask another pupil to find an explanation as to why the Department of Justice was so late in appearing.

A recent decision of the Supreme Court (Myers vs. United States) of October, 1926, upheld the President's power to remove officials without the consent of the Senate. A bill giving the President this power was enacted by the first Congress in an attempt to settle the question. The fact that the bill passed in the Senate only by the deciding vote of Vice-President Adams will serve to show a class the doubt that existed as to this interpretation of the Constitution. It will also show a strong characteristic of John Adams, who fearlessly used for the first time this power of the Vice-President.

In turning to Art. III of the Constitution, point out that it was necessary for the first Congress to decide how many justices

there should be in the Supreme Court, and how many and what kind of "inferior courts" should be created. The device of Circuit Courts, in which the judge of the district court and two justices of the Supreme Court "on circuit" formed a Circuit Court, can be emphasized as an example of economy in personnel and in practical efficiency.

Note the problem of raising revenue for this new government. That there should be a tariff was apparently accepted. How modern that early squabble seems as to whether or not this tariff should be protective. Should New England rum and nails and Pennsylvania iron be protected? Should producers of hemp in Carolina also be protected? It will be an entirely new idea to high school pupils that the first really unquestioned protective measure was the tonnage act of July 20, 1789. By discriminating between foreign and domestic vessels, allowing domestic vessels to pay an annual tonnage tax while the foreign vessels had to pay a tax on each voyage, the domestic coastwise trade became an American monopoly.

IV. The Work of the First Administration.—Determining Policies

After the teacher has shown, as indicated in the previous section, the work of the first Congress, in creating the machinery of the government and in providing for its support, the work of the first president and his cabinet should be considered. To begin with, it should be pointed out that executive officers have large responsibility and opportunity to determine policies and to select agents.

Call attention to the fact that the Constitution is not a logical consistent document, but "a bundle of compromises". In other words, it is a typical Anglo-Saxon production. Show that both Washington and Hamilton seemed to realize that the old order under the Articles of Confederation was at an end, and that they must meet the actual problems from the point of view and with the new authority of the new Constitution.

The problem of the debt and of the revenue can be used to show that Hamilton and Washington turned at once to the practical, political interpretation of the Constitution, rather than to the theoretical, legally literal interpretation. From that day to this the literalists, often with much show of legal learning and authority,

have opposed the liberal, practical, political interpretation of the Constitution. Hamilton's bank scheme was an early example of this policy and attitude toward the Constitution.

As in all such constitutional questions and discussions, the teacher should seek to have pupils understand all points of view, rather than to decide that one view is right and that the other views are all wrong. Otherwise, it would be about as profitable as for a class in arithmetic to try to determine whether plus or minus is right, or whether addition is more important than subtraction.

In foreign relations, Washington followed the practical, political point of view. His proclamation of neutrality seemed to many beside Secretary Jefferson to ignore or to violate our definite treaty obligations. The negotiation of new treaties by Jay and by Pinckney can best be taught as Washington's effort to solve the problems presented by real and serious difficulties with England and with Spain. Emphasize that the practical solution of a problem was sought, rather than an abstract general European or foreign policy. A similar practical problem,—the danger of a war with France in Adams' administration, led to the creation of the Department of the Navy as the fourth executive department. It is easy to show a class how inevitably the attitude of practical political interpretation of the Constitution was followed by later presidents: Jefferson had criticized liberal interpretation, yet he purchased Louisiana and urged the passage of the Embargo Act; Lincoln suspended the Writ of Habeas Corpus; Woodrow Wilson urged the government operation of the railroads.

V. The Supreme Court.—Interpreting the Constitution

The teacher has now shown how the first Congress determined the actual form of the government, and how the first administration established the practical policy of the government, acting under the Constitution. She must next undertake the explanation of the legal authoritative interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Marshall. This can best be done by a study of a few typical cases and decisions. One pupil may be assigned the work of investigating and reporting to the class on the facts of the case, while the explanation of the decision of the court might be assigned to another member of the class.

The teacher should always check as to the correctness of the pupil's statement of what he thought was done or said.

Of these cases, it is well to consider first, Marbury vs. Madison. The facts are simple and easily stated. The decision that a law of Congress was unconstitutional was a vital step in establishing the supremacy of the Supreme Court. This case answers the often repeated question, "What right has the Supreme Court to set aside a law of Congress?"

Show how a series of decisions limited the powers of the states. The judicial superiority of the federal courts was established through cases in which state laws forbidding appeals to federal courts were set aside,—Cohen vs. Va. or Martin vs. Hunter's Lessee can be studied for this principle. The decision in the Gibbons vs. Ogden case took from the states all authority in the regulation of interstate commerce. Then use the McCulloch vs. Md. case as an illustration of a limitation on state taxing power. As this case also decided that the United States Bank was constitutional the pupils will fully appreciate the alarm felt in some sections over the "encroachment" of the Federal authority. The study of these cases might be concluded with the Dartmouth College case. This case decisively showed the states that they must not violate their contract obligations.

VI. The Compact Theory,—League of States,—or Nation?

In taking up the inevitable, but apparently unsolvable problem as to the nature of the constitution, the Hayne-Webster debate offers the best center for the discussion. Special reports on the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions can cover the earlier political discussion of the question.

By reviewing the steps in the formation and ratification of the Constitution, show the class the uncertainty and the contradictions in the document itself and in the arguments used to support and to attack it. Point out that the real grievance of South Carolina was the government's protective tariff policy. The failure of the southern leaders to secure the support of President Jackson, together with the enactment of the tariff of 1828 caused these leaders to shift from political methods to constitutional argument. Here it might be pointed out, that defeated minorities

have commonly adopted these tactics,—turning to "trench warfare" and "digging in", behind some clause or interpretation of the Constitution.

The actual conflict can be presented to high school pupils as a three cornered fight between Jackson, Calhoun and Clay, and will furnish opportunity for "spirited" debate. The unexpected setback for the supporters of the "Compact Theory" might well be contrasted with the actual, successful "nullification" accomplished by Georgia during John Quincy Adams' administration.

Show that the important thing was really the concrete problem before the country and that the decision reached was the answer to that particular problem, rather than some general abstract theory of government. It would be worth while to ask this question: Why did the "Nationalist" victory of Jackson over South Carolina seem so much more important than the "particularist" victory of Georgia over Adams a few years earlier? This discussion of the "compact theory" of government can be closed by calling attention to the complete failure at that time to secure a real answer as to the nature of the Union. The question will have to be answered. How will it be answered? When?

VII. Slave Property or Free Soil?

The ten years from 1840 to 1850 can best be presented to high school pupils from the point of view of territorial expansion. The most important things to emphasize would, therefore, be in the fields of diplomatic, military, political and economic history, rather than questions primarily constitutional.

But, in the decade from 1850 to 1860 a great fundamental constitutional problem presented itself and the failure to reach a solution made the Civil War inevitable. Fundamentally, it was a phase of the old question as to which is the more paramount, "property rights" or "human rights". In this case it grew out of the demand that Congress should legislate for United States territories from the point of view of human rights rather than merely from the point of view of property rights. The essential difference in this point of view is clearly shown if we contrast the Personal Liberty Laws of many states with the protection of property involved in the Fugitive Slave Law.

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court made the political and judicial decisions unacceptable to the ardent believers in "human rights" who gained control of the government in the election of 1860. The Dred Scott case and decision must be studied as the center of the whole problem. The dissenting opinion of Justice Curtis should be presented as well as the famous dicta of Chief Justice Taney.

VIII. The Civil War Amendments

Constitutional history must deal with the Civil War amendmentst—he thirteenth, the fourteenth and the fifteenth. Teachers should show that the purpose and significance of each of these amendments is different from the others. It is interesting to note that in the thirteenth amendment is found the first authorization for Federal control over labor and labor problems.

The fourteenth amendment involves a series of difficult but important problems which have grown out of it. "Did the fourteenth amendment transfer from the state to the federal government the protection of individual liberty?" In the Slaughter House cases a majority of the court decided that no such transfer took place and that the "due process of law" is the "due process of law" of the individual states. Thus, the possibility of nationalizing the responsibility for the defense of all personal liberty was averted.

Teachers should point out to their classes that the fifteenth amendment took from the states their accustomed right to determine who might and who might not vote in the state. It should be shown that this amendment was a precedent for a later amendment, the nineteenth.

Nullification of the constitution is an interesting subject. It might be well to call attention to methods used whereby section two of the fourteenth as well as the fifteenth amendment are "null and void" in some states. Nullification of constitutional amendments are not confined to any one section of the country. Note the attitude of some states toward the eighteenth amendment; "a plan of death by inaction". Does this soothe the American conscience in its demand for law observance?

IX. Corporations and the Constitution.

During the 1880's and 1890's the rapid increase of railroads, both in mileage and in importance for community and state prosperity brought up a series of cases commonly called the "Granger Cases", in which a solution was sought to the triangular problems,—the relative rights and privileges of the railroads, of the governments, (local, state and federal) and of the public.

The change from the *laissez faire* point of view that the railroads were purely private property to the public utility point of view of the present, should be pointed out to high school pupils. Supreme Court decisions make it clear that the attempt to control railroads through state legislation, as in the Granger Laws, and through state railroad commissions were unconstitutional as the Federal government is given constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce.

The increasing importance of federal regulation can be shown by contrasting the first Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 with the rate establishing Hepburn Act of 1906. The Esch-Cummings Act of 1910 included telegraph and telephone communication. This act might be compared with the Adamson Act of 1916 which regulated work on the railroads as well as rates.

National rather than local control of industries brought on similar and perhaps more complicated difficulties, which called for important court decisions. Roosevelt's characteristic comment on the value of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, "as effective as a Papal Bull against a comet" might be justified by the results of the first ten years following its enactment. During these ten years trusts sprang up in increasing size and number. This law, however, in later years made possible the dissolution of many trusts including the Northern Securities Company and the reorganization of the Standard Oil and American Tobacco Companies. In studying these cases teachers should emphasize the point that congressional legislation was entering new fields. This has much more value than merely listing the laws and Supreme Court decisions.

X. The Spanish War Adds Dependencies.

The war with Spain, among other unexpected results, raised serious questions involving the Constitution. An often asked

question of the time was, "Does the Constitution follow the flag?" In the so-called Insular Cases some epoch-making court decisions were handed down. The Supreme Court announced that though Porto Rico belonged to the United States the Porto Ricans were citizens of Porto Rico and not citizens of the United States. The Court also decided that duties might be collected on goods brought into the United States from Porto Rico and the Philippines.

XI. 20th Century Amendments

Teachers should point out to their pupils that the term, "New Social Democracy" used by Charles A. Beard (Rise of American Democracy, Vol. II, p. 589) might well be used also to characterize the purpose and tendency of the last four amendments to the Constitution. Although they all came within a period of seven years, 1913-1920, they cover a very wide range of subjects, from income taxation to woman suffrage. Each of these four amendments can be shown to be an expression of the increasing American demand for constitutional embodiment of ideals calling for social justice and greater actual democracy; typical of the second decade of this century.

XII. Summary

Thus, the Constitution of 1787, a document of seven articles, has grown to the Constitution of today; nineteen amendments have been added. A plan of government suitable for a union of thirteen states with a population of less than four million has grown with the nation so that it is equally suitable as the fundamental law for a country of forty-eight states with a population of over one hundred million.

The nineteen amendments, however, do not constitute the only growth in the constitution. This growth has been gradual yet continuous. Laws enacted to carry out the purposes of the constitution together with judicial decisions have developed a body of precedent or law of custom. Extra-constitutional devices have been added to our political practice such as party machinery which brings about the election of a president without changing the constitutional provisions for his election. (See Art. II and amendment XII.)

Patrick Henry's sentiment of 1775,—"I am not a Virginian but an American" has become tradition in this country. The opposition to a "third term" is also almost tradition. It is each year becoming more difficult to define and exactly locate our constitution. Our aims should be to teach our pupils of a living and growing constitution. This opportunity is offered in American History courses.

EDMUND S. NOYES

TEACHING ECONOMICS AS A PRACTICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE

In considering this subject—teaching economics as a practical social science—there comes repeatedly to my mind a phrase used by Henry W. Grady, the great Southern editor and orator. "There was a South of slavery and secession; that South is dead. There is a South of liberty and freedom; that South, thank God, is living, breathing, growing every hour." There is an analogy in the world of economic study. There was an economics of cold laws and formal logic; that economics is dying, if not dead. There is an economics full of the life, the vigor, and the realism of a growing society; that economics is becoming the economics of today.

Nothing, however, is farther from my desire than to attempt an odious comparison between the older economics and the new. All students of society owe a great debt to the penetrating thought, the breadth of view, and the astonishingly critical analysis of the older generations of economists; but as they were men of their own generation in thought, in material, and in point of view, the very spirit of their work suggests to us the desirability of being ourselves in our time—of seeing the world as it is rather than it was, of utilizing in our teaching and our writing, so far as we can, the contributions of modern students of industry, psychology, and philosophy.

Two definitions—an older and a newer one—will provide the first step towards what I would like to suggest as economics as a practical social science. The first is taken from Professor Clark's *Essentials of Economic Theory*, a book published only 20 years ago. It reads as follows:

> The creation and the use of wealth are everywhere governed by natural laws, and these as discovered and stated constitute the science of economics.

For purposes of this discussion, I will risk the formulation of a second by saying:

> Economics is a study of the activities of people working together in securing from their physical surroundings whatever they do secure.

Of course, not every 1929 economist would agree with this definition, and for certain purposes I should like to modify it myself. But as a definition for introducing students to a study of economics, I would not, for the present, ask for a better one.

In each of these definitions economics is seen as a study of society. In the first it is the study of the creation and use of wealth as governed by natural laws. It is a science apparently in the sense that physics, chemistry, and biology are sciences. In the second definition, economics is also seen as a study of society, but hardly a study of laws which, if they exist at all, are well-known and established. It is rather a study of human beings attempting and succeeding, attempting and failing, but always attempting to determine what is worth while and how those worth while things may best be accomplished. In terms of the second definition, economics is considered as a combination of social philosophy and social engineering about either of which no one knows very much, and about both of which everyone wants to know so much that they become fascinating fields of study for those who so view the subject. For economics is essentially not something to be learned; it is essentially a field of work. Let me put a number of these generalizations into a somewhat more definite and practical form.

May I suggest that to teach economics as a practical social science, it be taught as a project—a single project—the problem of a society attempting to live as well and happily as possible. Here, in my judgment, it should be emphasized that the project should be put before a class not at all as an academic matter; not at all as a matter about which things can be learned for passing an examination. There is no course like an introductory course in economics for introducing students to the idea that they are an active, living, and important part of the subject matter of the course they are taking. As members of society, they participate in its economic activities. They are effected by the economic activities of others in an infinite variety of ways. They aid in forming social policies. This is not a question of duty or of citizenship. It is merely a fact. Let us consider what are some of the

elements in a course in economics considered as a project study of living and working together. I think such a project study can be divided into two elementary parts, each of which may be considered as a project by itself, and the second of which has in turn several sub-projects, or parts.

Two main questions which confront society as a whole, or which may be thought of as confronting any social group, are these:

1. What are the resources available? In terms of a general study of economics, it is best, perhaps, to ask—what are the resources available to society?

2. What things must be done to utilize these resources in the ways that we want them utilized? This is really all there is to social life. It is in attempting to get the answer to these two questions that human activity is constantly concerned. Let us examine each of them in a little more detail. The first project is, what are the resources available to society? It is unnecessary to say to this audience that our social equipment includes our natural resources, plus all of our supply of physical goods: railroads, factories, buildings, streets, roads, and machines, and that we may also include ourselves, as the possessors of a supply of working ability of many kinds and qualities. During all of our life, everything which we may hope to obtain as a social group rests finally on the fact that we have these resources. Of course, originally, the natural resources were the only ones available, but during the long process of social history we have added to these the great supplies of capital equipment which are of invaluable aid in using our natural surroundings. Through education and training in specialized abilities we have also improved our resources of working power in very great measure. If students are given the project of discovering for themselves the quantity, and to some extent the quality, of the resources of our country, or even of the world, and if they once become conscious of the importance of resources to them and to others, the ordinary high school subjects of commercial geography, of physical geography, will have a new meaning. Even the Census reports and other sources which furnish statistics on our supplies of this sort will become almost interesting reading matter. Here we are, over a hundred million people,—if we think of the United States alone—trying to secure a living, and

as good a living as possible. What are the resources upon which we may draw, their extent, their limits, their qualities?

From such an approach the mere statistical facts are not the only elements of interest. One of the difficulties with resources is the fact that they are limited. From this fact grows all of our efforts in the realm of physical research. The main purpose of physical and chemical research is to discover possible additions to our supply of natural resources. Through the limitations of our resources arise all the stirring questions of conservation versus use and of the desirability of using resources at one thing rather than at another. Most of you will remember that during the war the cry of "business as usual" was raised. It was a hard lesson for Americans—it was an even harder one for Englishmen—to learn that we did not have resources enough to supply ourselves with all the goods of peace-time and at the same time to manufacture the munitions of war. Business as usual was impossible, but England was almost defeated before she discovered that the limitations of resources made that the case.

Dozens of other interesting and extremely practical economic, historical, and political questions can be raised and discussed in connection with this matter of society's resources. Time permits only a few examples. The wars which have been waged for the possession of land or ports or mines will come to the mind of every history teacher. One great geographer has said that the great war was essentially a struggle between France and Germany for the possession of land or ports or mines will come to the mind of every cussion involving oil resources in Mexico. Restriction schemes for rubber, coffee, and other supplies are nothing but ways of attempting to profit by the ownership of highly specialized natural resources, of climate, of rainfall, or other physical conditions.

Leaving now the first,—the discovery of our resources,—we will consider for a few moments the second main project. What must be done to make these resources useful? This major project, as I see it, can well be broken into four sub-projects. First, who organizes the work of converting our resources into the things we get from them—the many types of goods and services, the use of which makes up our standard of living? This project or problem, as I see it, is the very central one, the one around which a very large part of a study of economics, and for that matter civics, can

be organized. We could, of course, think of a world in which each one of us attempted to secure from nature everything that he wanted; but if we are to work co-operatively, there must be organization, and somebody must be responsible for organizing it. Simple examples such as the necessity for class organization are sometimes helpful in making this point vividly apparent. It is important, I think, that the student think about this question of organization. I believe that if it is put to him as a question, he will come rather readily to see that we rely on two types of organization in the world as we know it. The first may be called individual enterprise, and the second public enterprise. For organizing many types of work to produce many things, we permit any individual who wishes to do so to go ahead. This is individual enterprise. Men may start factories for making shoes, clothing, machinery, brick, lumber, and automobiles with the greatest freedom. There are some slight restrictions on their operations, but the field of private enterprise is very wide indeed. On the other hand, we use public enterprise, to supply ourselves with protection—by means of a police force, and an army, and a navy. We use public enterprise to supply ourselves with parks, streets, water supply, education, mail service, a large amount of health protection, and a variety of other goods and services, with the production of which the efforts of our various governments are concerned.

Private enterprise works through businesses. An individual business, a partnership, corporation, a holding company, or what not, are only examples of the ways in which private enterprises organize to carry on their work. Once the student sees this, he finds it easy to see why one form is suitable for one purpose, another for another. It is easy also for him to see that private enterprise, regardless of the form of business it uses, finds it, in greater or less degree, necessary to borrow money to buy, to sell, to employ, to make goods, to communicate, and to transport. Once it is seen that these activities are required by every business, we have a clue to almost every possible vocation and its relation to social life as a whole. In organizing to carry on these six activities, the positions or jobs of our business world are created. It is difficult indeed to find a possible job that does not fall in one of these classes of work or in the directing of one of them.

On the other hand, how does public enterprise work? It works through governments. I want to be sure that I am understood to say governments in the plural, not in the singular. When we use that word in the singular, it becomes an abstraction, an unreality, capable of inciting all sorts of foolish ideas. When we use it in the plural, it is easy to see that governments in a democracy like ours are little more than committees, large or small, that we have set up to do various kinds of work for us. A government should never be created excepting to do some useful work. It is as useful as it is capable of doing work we want done more effectively or more economically than private business is capable of doing. There are, as a matter of fact, certain things which we can do better in a public way through governments than we can do them through the efforts of private individuals. Let anyone who has a different idea of sovereignty than the one I have just expressed—that in a democracy the basis of government should be the desire to get some useful work done—consider our own first attempt at national government under the Articles of Confederation. Let him recall what a futile and useless thing that government was and how the need for getting certain things done, such as the regulation of trade and universal coinage, influenced the construction of our present national government.

Governments must be planned by the architects—the constitutional conventions or other bodies—and then the plans must be interpreted through the years by the builders—the legislatures and the courts (as Mr. Noyes has so enjoyably pointed out.) Their personnel must be chosen and re-chosen. This, of course, is the work of politics. I would ask no better way to get students to thinking about politics than to have them see that the only reason we need governments is to get certain things done and then to put up to the student the question of how we can best organize to choose a personnel for planning those tasks and executing them. To my way of thinking, such a way of approaching the matter is more conducive to a healthy and wholesome attitude toward government than anything we can accomplish by talking sanctimoniously about the duties of citizenship.

Governments, like businesses, have tasks necessary to their work. They, too, must secure money, buy, sell, employ personnel, communicate, and transport. In carrying on these tasks, govern-

ments, like businesses, create vocations—all the vocations of government service. In many of these fields the vocations established by governments are indistinguishable in nature from those of private business. A man may work in a government gun plant and for all practical purposes be employed by the Bethlehem Steel Company. If he works for the United States Shipping Board as an engineer on a liner, he is doing essentially the same thing he would do if he were employed by a private shipping company. Certain of these six major tasks are carried on by governments very differently from the way in which they are carried on by private business. Private business, for example, secures funds by borrowing; governments by taxation. The contrast of the two methods makes as pretty a study as anyone could wish for several days of class discussion. Governments, in times of peace, buy supplies and services much as private businesses do. In times of war they buy almost everything but services. These are secured through voluntary offerings or through drafts—exactly like taxes. That is also a most interesting subject for consideration, this way in which in times of emergency there can be secured the most valuable of all possessions for the most dangerous of all occupations, without thought of compensation, (unless one counts $30 a month as compensation for facing bullets). Of course, for such service real compensation is impossible. Nor do governments sell to the extent that private businesses do. Most of their services are in effect given away. Each of us may drive on the public streets, send our children to public school, visit the public zoo, join the Easter parade on the public sidewalk whether he has paid taxes or not. What more interesting question for a class meeting than the relative merits of the two ways of securing goods—by purchase from private business or by gift from governments—paid for, indeed, in the second case but paid for by the interesting indirect process of taxation, which has always meant that some have paid heavily and some have paid little? A week's discussion will not give a full answer to the issues that will be raised by such a question. This one question alone will stir up enough thoughts for a good course in economics.

I have spent so much time on this matter of the organizers, private and public, of social life that I shall touch only briefly the

other projects which seem to me subordinates to our second main question of what must be done to make our resources available. Indeed, the others, in part, have been covered by what has already been said. A second sub-project is involved in the question, how shall we decide what things are to be made from our resources? It is in connection with this question, I think, that the significance of private property is most easily handled. If all of our resources were owned by the public, it is probable that we would not have anything but public enterprise as a way of supplying our wishes. But, as a matter of fact, a large part of our resources of every description are owned by private individuals. We each own something, our own ability to work if nothing else. As a result the productive activity of society has become a vast market place in which the decision as to what shall be made is decided, so far as private business is concerned, by the answer to the question, what will profit most. Putting it very briefly, each of us in spending what he spends, suggests to a business man the desirability of making available those articles for which we bid with our dollars. The old phrase, money talks, is no more true anywhere than in the work of deciding what goods shall be produced, and how many of each kind. In production carried on by governments, as has already been suggested, this pecuniary bidding is not so prevalent. We have what we may call a "social good" method of determining what shall be had. Congress decides that it will, or will not, be to the social good to have 16 cruisers. In Chicago, and in other cities, the mayor and the alderman decide that it will, or will not be good to pave the streets or to extend the parks, or police the gunmen. However it is decided, it has never been decided so that everyone got everything he wanted. It is worth while for any student to see the several reasons for this—it is partly a question of the wealth which one may have earned, or inherited, or found, or stolen, or married (this is not meant to be working toward a climax), partly a question of his own ability, partly a question of how wise public agencies have been, and always a question of the fact that resources are limited and that our power to produce everything that everybody wants is insufficient.

A third sub-project of our second main question, namely, what must be done to make our resources available, may be expressed

in this way: How are our resources converted into the things which are desired? If students set out to get the answer to this question themselves, they will open another great range of practical matters. They will disclose to themselves the uses of machinery, factories, railroads, warehouses, and all the other paraphernalia by means of which we take nature and convert it to our needs. The entire field of manufacture in all its myriad forms is involved in considering this question, as are those of transport and trade, if we consider them, as economists usually do, as part of the process of production.

Finally, as a fourth phase of the question, what must be done, we must ask—how shall we decide how much each person shall have of what is made available from our social resources? We have been given certain social resources. We make things from them. How shall these things be divided? In some ways this question is the most practical of all. At least it is the one which has, through history, given cause to more revolutions, more feeling of ill will within social groups, more sense of injustice, more feeling of conflict between ethics and facts, than any other one of those discussed. Of course, no modern teacher would try to lead students to believe that the products of our economic machine are divided according to the work done by each. No one, it seems to me, can do that excepting he define work in a way which really evades the point and begs the whole question. Indeed, in discussing the way in which we decide what goods shall be made, it already appears that we have largely discussed the question of how goods shall be divided. So far as private business is concerned, one gets what one can buy; and one can buy according to what one has; and one sometimes has not only because he worked hard and long and effectively, but because he picked his father with rare pecuniary discrimination, or settled on an unfertile piece of land under which someone later accidentally discovered coal or oil.

In concluding, may I say that such an approach to teaching economics as I have attempted to suggest is merely a method calculated to help students see themselves as parts of the great social task of utilizing resources in making a living for society, and dividing that living among the individual members. But, as I attempted to say at the beginning, the problem of discovering resources, of deciding how to use them and when, the problem of deciding what to use them for, and the problem of distributing the

results of production, raise questions—as many questions which require our thinking about ends and purposes as require our thinking about means. In neither field have we yet reached the best knowledge that we may hope to attain. The world needs men and women interested in such engineering questions as the discovery and transformation of resources, but it needs these men and women also interested in the questions of what goods can most usefully be made and how these can, with the greatest degree of equity, be distributed.

LEVERETT S. LYON

ADDRESS OF GREETING

Greetings to the History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland:

If it were not for the fact that you will very shortly realize that I am not a good after-dinner speaker, I should feel called upon to inform you of that fact at the outset. The ability to be felicitous on an occasion like this appears to be a natural gift and not an ability easily acquired; otherwise, there would certainly be a larger number of people in the world who would have undertaken to prepare themselves to make effective after-dinner speeches.

Even though such an ability could be acquired, I fear that most busy superintendents of schools would find very little time to devote to preparing themselves to qualify for after-dinner speaking. I suppose most people find it difficult to imagine how a superintendent of schools in a large city, or even in a small city, can find enough work to keep him busy. Their conception of the superintendent seems to be that conception carried in a story told by a colleague of mine of his experience in his home city.

While strolling through the park one hot summer day, he found a group of a dozen or fifteen boys and girls of elementary school age playing school. Despite the hot weather and the fact that it was vacation, they had organized a school similar to that elementary school which they attended. The part of each teacher was being taken by one of the children. One little boy was even taking the part of the colored janitor. One little boy, youngest of the group, didn't seem to be participating in the exercises, whereupon my superintendent friend inquired about it. The leader of the group of children explained that this little boy was too little and didn't know enough to take the part of any of the teachers, so they had made him superintendent of schools.

The Superintendent of Schools in the Nation's capital enjoys the rare privilege of participating in an unusually large number of meetings held in Washington. More and more, headquarters of national associations are being established in this great city.

It is a real pleasure for me, as Superintendent of Schools, to extend to the history teachers of the Middle States and Maryland

cordial greetings on this occasion. It is a greater pleasure because in my collegiate work I prepared to be a teacher of history. I am, therefore, very deeply interested not only officially but personally in the teaching of history.

I consider the subject of history and the other social studies unparalleled, except possibly by literature, in their educational possibilities. It is my belief that no other subjects offer richer material by means of which the teacher is to give boys and girls an intelligent understanding of the Nation, its life, its ideals, and its possibilities.

It is altogether fitting and proper that the history teachers of the Middle States and Maryland should meet in the Nation's capital, filled as it is with so many evidences of those things which have made us great as a nation. In the Nation's capital are to be found the various branches of the national government. Here one may observe and study the workings of the machinery of the national government. This machinery, however, illustrates but the methods by which desired results are to be achieved. The machinery itself is significant only as a means to an end.

In the Nation's capital may be found statues and monuments erected in memory of the men who have contributed so richly to the foundation and progress of our American institutions. The Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial and the many other statues to be found here have been erected as a tangible evidence of the abiding faith of the American people in the ideals for which these men fought and the service which they rendered, not only to this Nation, but to the world, in their self-sacrificing lives of public service. Correspondingly, the memory of our great heroes is perpetually enshrined in similar manner throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The teacher of history, above all other teachers, has a patriotic duty to perform in undertaking to draw from the lives of these men those ideals and qualities which should be transmitted from one generation to the next. The study of the lives of our great men should provide the boys and girls in our schools with a clear conception of their high ideals, their noble purposes, and their effective action which should become the guiding principles of these same boys and girls when they reach manhood and womanhood.

No other subject of study in our American public schools brings the teacher and the pupil more directly into the current of every-day life and thought than the study of history. The teacher of history must inevitably deal with the unsolved economic, social, and political problems of the day. This is at once a challenge and an opportunity; a *challenge*, to exercise discretion and good judgment in the selection of material and in the method of presentation, and an *opportunity*, to give the boys and girls in our schools an intelligent understanding of the current problems of public life with which they must inevitably grapple as they reach manhood and womanhood.

Would that every teacher of history could deal with every controversial problem as effectively as a professor of economics whom I knew, who, in dealing with a problem like the protective tariff and free trade, left his class entirely ignorant whether he, himself, favored one or the other.

It is said that every American citizen has two homes, one where he resides and the other Washington, D. C. Since this is one of your homes, it is not necessary for me to give you a key to the city. Rather, I extend to you the right hand of fellowship as one member of the family welcomes another into the home.

I hope that you will feel at the close of your meeting that it was as profitable for you to be here as I am sure it has been agreeable to us to have you meet in this city. It is always particularly pleasant and agreeable for people engaged in the same line of professional work to meet together.

"It's the human touch in this world that counts,
the touch of your hand and mine
That means far more to the aching heart than
shelter, or food, or wine.
For the shelter is gone when the day is o'er
and the food lasts only a day,
But the touch of the hand and the sound of the
voice live on in the world alway."

FRANK W. BALLOU

THE NEW BIOGRAPHY

The new biography is modernist art. It is a realistic, almost a naked, portrayal of a striking historical personage by an artist who has cultivated the artifices of a dramatist and a clever novelist. It has little in common with the modern *scientific biography* upon whose pedestrian scholarship it inevitably relies for information and background. It breathes rebellion against the scholarly dullness of the professor who emerges tired and dusty from book-stacks and archives. It is spritely, challenging, and brilliant; it is free from annoying doubts and footnotes. *The new biography* is a violent assault upon the *old biography* of confessed hero-worshippers and moralists who apparently died with the Victorians. *The new biography* is a product of the present. It is of this smart age which would be amused rather than instructed or even saved.

Only a consideration of *the old biography* can offer an explanation of the almost warranted excesses of the *new biography*. To appreciate the New England of James Truslow Adams, one must go back to that of John Fiske. In the olden days when a local worthy died, there soon appeared a memoir by a son or daughter or at least by some needy relative. If the merchant or lawyer was a church-goer, his minister might narrate his life and append a few of his letters, in lieu of a literary kinsman. If the subject was a smuggler of goods, if he drank too much flip or maderia, if he was a slaver, if he drove hard bargains, if he charged usurious interest, if he was guilty of sharp practices in his general store and loan office, if he lived by the kinks in the law, if he abused his slaves or indentured servants, if he failed to pay English merchants for his imports, if he speculated in soldiers' land grants, if he cheated Indian hunters, if he prosecuted dissenters, if he burned witches—all was forgiven with death,—at least all was forgotten by his friendly memorialist. He was described as he should have lived: a godly man, a pillar of the church, a loving husband to one or more wives, a kindly father, a public spirited citizen, and, if he outlived the colonial era, a soldier and a stout patriot. His life was made a lesson in righteousness. Contemporaries in town or

county might smile as they read the eulogy but cynical gossip was not engraven in print or on a tomb stone. If the deceased happened to be a minister of the gospel, his successor in the pulpit recounted his life work and extolled his spirituality. Of the dead no evil was spoken unless the deceased was a rebel, an infidel, or a Tory who had broken with the standing order and orthodoxy. Then the individual's vices might be stressed to teach a moral. Shelves are filled with loving sketches of uninteresting lives which veil the information of most value to the social historian.

A personage of national note on the winning side demanded a biography rather than a memoir. Again, it was a relative or a disciple who garbled the letters and censored the evidence in honor of the dead and for the safety of the family. Even harmless skeletons were locked securely in closets. The hero was a virtuous man with few blemishes. He may have been wronged by his opponents, but he was ever in the right. Hero-worshippers often stress the evil motives of their hero's enemies. Thus doubts are raised which the historian can turn to advantage. The old biographer described his subject from birth to death as a military genius, a learned jurist, a great statesman, or a sainted ecclesiastic. There was no evolution; environment counted for little. The man was consistently great at all stages of his career. He was a man of destiny, a super-man. A long book could be written with scarcely a reference to the hero's mother and wife—indeed, *the old biographer* noted female existence only at the baptismal font, the altar, and the grave. There was a literary weakness in such biographies, aside from the chronological sameness. There was not that contrast of light and shade, of weakness and of strength which would make the hero's greatness stand out. There was a stone image, not a man of flesh and blood. It was at the hands of such partisan biographers that the fathers of the nation suffered.

Their biographers canonized them and created a legend which critical research is laying low. Thus their fame has been actually injured. They seem of lower stature and their deeds less glorious than was probably the case. Washington, a truly great man even after his detractors are through spattering his memory with innuendoes, was injured by the biographies of John Marshall and Jared Sparks. His fame was almost jeopardized by the pious in-

ventions and fables of the Reverend Mason L. Weems. It required the united labours of such biographers as P. L. Ford, Worthington C. Ford, Woodrow Wilson, and Henry Cabot Lodge to rescue a true Washington from the obscure legendary picture which his friends had painted. The Adamses saved themselves by leaving voluminous letters and introspective diaries. When writing each other's biographies or their own autobiographies, they attained a marvellous degree of detachment along with an assurance of their own greatness. The Hartford Convention figures have never been purified, and certainly not by Senator Lodge's account of George Cabot. Beard in his *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* infers motives to the framers with considerable gusto, without really minimizing their contribution. Had the same material been given by their biographers, less harm would have been done. Jonathan Edwards, even though the owner of a slave and despite a reputed connection with a distillery, was a far greater philosopher than his religious biographers allowed him to be. J. S. Bassett's *Andrew Jackson* is a living man and as such is far greater than Parton's heroic Jackson. Jefferson's enemies, though they portrayed him as a dangerous demagogue, a deist, and a radical, were kinder to his memory from a modern point of view than his political disciples who stood too close to appreciate the true Jefferson. James Sheahan left room for Allen Johnson's scientific biography of Stephen A. Douglas. Lincoln had to be salvaged from his friends and neighbors by a whole series of modern exponents. Nicolay and Hay edited ten volumes but it is to the unfinished life by the late Senator Beveridge that men will turn to find the truth and nothing but the truth as far as it can be ascertained concerning Lincoln. As an example of malicious condemnation by *the old biographers*, one might sight Thomas Paine whose services were belittled because of his heterodoxy. It required lives by both Conway and Sedgwick before there was a correct appraisal of that hearty revolutionist. Campaign biographies in which the candidate is written up by a prospective place-hunter, are also desperately hard to live down; a defeated candidate's memory never survives the eulogy, and a president must blush when he reads the panegyric.

A business age has been more efficient in selecting its biographers. Organizations appoint historiographers much as they do

publicity agents. If the story of big business is going to be written, it must be written by a friendly pen. Nothing is left to chance. Religious organizations have official historians as well as political parties. Prudent men name biographers in their wills even as they do executors. Thus there is a careful account made available which will serve the later historian who will find at least some of his materials at hand for a real biography. Sometimes even prudent men make mistakes, as when Cardinal Manning selected Edward S. Purcell whose rather full biography required official revision. Yet it was Purcell's two volumes which made possible Lytton Strachey's unfair account of Manning in his *Eminent Victorians*. Obviously Strachey did nothing but popularize Purcell's work and make it known to a far wider audience. As one looks through the cautious lives of men like Strathcona, Hill, Harriman, and Judge Gray, one wonders if these builders of the Nation were not bigger men than careful pens have dared to portray them. Among prelates, Cardinal Gibbons deserved a far greater biography. Woodrow Wilson will outlive the legends which are being woven and the paneygrics which are being written by his well meaning admirers. In days to come there will be a book on the True Woodrow Wilson. Another generation will not be satisfied with the description of Roosevelt which we now have in printed form. It will want the real Roosevelt.

The advent of the historical seminar and the creation of an American school of scientific historians brought in their wake an interest in the scientific biography. Soon the Life and Letters type appeared. These biographies were long, painstaking productions with all the paraphernalia of scholarship including imposing bibliographies. There was little hero worship. Indeed the author might bend backward. On the other hand there was no detraction or intimation of moral or political irregularities unless these were substantiated. There was no attempt to be dramatic and there were no cheap appeals to the reader. They sought the truth and told the truth in unvarnished language. They searched tirelessly for all the evidence and they weighed this evidence with a just balance. Unfortunately, they did not always write interestingly. They wrote for students, not for the public; hence their works made no wide appeal. Their scholarship did not effect the public which still insisted on its legends and

its heroes. Yet this was a school of honest writers upon whose work we can rely and upon whose analysis we can place faith. Aside from individual publications, their work is to be found in such series as *The Makers of America*, the so-called True Biographies, Great Commanders, American Statesmen, Beacon Biographies, and American Crisis Biographies. Lesser figures were conscientiously written by local historians and by graduate students, though unfortunately our graduate schools have frowned upon biographies as dissertations. The scientific biographer did his work well, and it is on his labors that the insecure fame of the present new biographer rests.

Among recent biographies, there are some examples of splendid character studies, frank but honest, interpretative of the man and his environment, which the most conservative can commend. For instance, nowhere can there be found so thorough a study of Sam Adams as that of Ralph Harlow. Based on sound research, this volume presents a full length portrait of Adams's accomplishment as a promoter of the Revolution. There is no hesitancy in stating bald facts; there is no vestige of white-wash. Lord Charnwood's *Lincoln* deserves its wide readership as does the superb study of Stephenson in *Lincoln: An account of his Personal Life.* Again, Stephenson's *Autobiography of Lincoln* is a clever interpretation based upon Lincoln's letters, speeches, and conversation. Though of course Lincoln left no autobiography, this creation as a book of readings can be objectionable only to the most meticulous. It is quite as intriguing as an actual autobiography. An excellent example of what can be done in the way of constructive and entertaining literature is found in W. R. Thayer's *George Washington.* Agnes Repplier's *Père Marquette* is written in the characteristic vein of this charming essayist. It is done with sufficient historical accuracy as far as the general reader is concerned, though the sober historian will scarcely appeal to this work for information concerning the picturesque missionary-explorer. However, there is no better example of skillful popularization; and it cannot be denied that there is a legitimate field for the literateur in the semi-historical biography which will probably replace the dying historical novel.

The foundation of the re-write school of new biographers is ascribed to Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians* which appeared

in 1918. In a defensive introduction Mr. Strachey pointed out: "With us [in England] the most delicate and humane of all the branches of the art of writing has been relegated to the journeymen of letters: we do not reflect that it is perhaps as difficult to write a good life as to live one. Those two fat volumes, with which it is our custom to commemorate the dead—who does not know them, with their ill digested masses of material, their slipshod style, their tone of tedious panegyric, their lamentable lack of detachment, of design? They are as familiar as the cortège of the undertaker and wear the same air of slow, funereal barbarism." Yet Mr. Strachey admits that it is from these tedious volumes which he has drawn his material which looks fresh in the reburnished form of the master hand. He did succeed in casting shadows on popular idols like Manning, Florence Nightingale, Doctor Arnold, and General Gordon, but no critical reader will acquit the author of straining his evidence, of creating false impressions by inference or rhetorical question and of harping upon the prejudices of his readers. The average man may be satisfied, but the student is going to read deeper. This may be one of the good results of this rather dangerous form of popularization. In *Queen Victoria* (1921), Strachey is more the master of his art. In his decidedly entertaining essay, he has no doubt shattered the legendary Victoria of the masses but it is doubtful if he has revised the thinking man's picture of the leading English middle class wife and mother of the last century. He has divulged the knowledge of the few to the many. He has made no contribution for the historian or the teacher of history. In *Elizabeth and Essex* (1928), Strachey has a better subject—powerful figures in a critical time, intrigues, wars, scandals, and the Irish question all combined. This is what the *New biography* requires; a startling character in a revolutionary environment.

Strachey's success has inspired a large school of imitators. In England the best known are Harold Nicholson who has written a book on *The Development of English Biography* as well as sketches of Tennyson and Byron; and Philip Guedalla who has recently published a brilliant, literary characterization of *Gladstone and Palmerston*. In Germany the chief exponent is the prolific Emil Ludwig whose experience as a dramatist has enabled him to dramatize his Goethe, Napoleon, Bismarck, and Wilhelm Hohen-

zollern, putting into their mouths invented dialogues which approximate more or less closely what these men might have said under given circumstances. Personality, psychological interpretation, and human interest are attained at the expense of actual facts. An artist's use of words, a fair knowledge of the general field, a skillful weaving of details so as to win the appearance of authenticity and a journalistic sense are combined to give an impression of the man and his career. Apparently Ludwig is read in the original and in translation. Indeed the public with whetted appetite calls for more; and the author is ever ready to supply the demand, for he has the talent and the labor is already done by the scientific, dry-as-dust German scholar.

In France the master of the school is André Maurois, son of a Lille manufacturer, a veteran of the World War, a deep student of English literature, and a writer who has the Gallic touch: irony, animation, conciseness, and paradox. A psychologist and a journalist, he explains the success of his *Disraeli* in *Aspects de Biographie* with the conjuror's delight in showing up his own tricks. He has but commenced, but he gives promise of out doing Strachey and Ludwig.

In the American field we have books of the type of Phillip Russell's *Benjamin Franklin: the First Civilized American*, Albert J. Noch's *Jefferson*, Rupert Hughes's, *George Washington: the Man and the Hero*, W. E. Woodward's, *George Washington: the Image and the Man*, Werner's *Brigham Young*, and Carl Sandburg's *Prairie Years*. In a sense Gamaliel Bradford might be included with his *Darwin*, *Bare Souls*, *Wives*, *Damaged Souls*, *D. L. Moody*, *A Worker in Souls*, and volumes of essays with similar titles. All these men are at heart novelists who have found the new field more exciting.

This new school has the tone of the *American Mercury*. It breathes rebellion. It is dangerously enticing for the young and partly-educated. It is not pedantic but it speaks with a charming excathedra air as it creates a "new character" in place of the "white-washed hero" whom it presumes to make real. Rebels often detest dogma and yet are dogmatic. This school can never rewrite the whole field of national worthies. It only selects those it considers vulnerable. It would rather discover a new sire for Lincoln, a new mistress for Charles II, a new vice in Byron, an-

other flaw in Shelley, another intrigue of Elizabeth's, and another weakness in Washington than actually fulfill its reputed purpose of giving the world its leaders as they were. Tainted men, damaged statesmen, and persecuted rebels offer subjects which the new school can handle satisfactorily. Debunking is the plea, but dubious evidence is framed. To dissect and destroy is easier than to build.

Because one may read the new biography as he reads a novel is no reason why he cannot see its dangers. Because he sees its pitfalls does not mean that he believes that it is a kindness to George Washington to "correct his whole life into a textbook of rhetoric and a copybook of conduct for children". It does not mean that he wants his saints whitewashed, or his history to be edifying. It may however suggest that he prefers to take his literature straight and go to the conservative, laborious researchers for his biography and, let us say, for his short biographical notices to the new *Dictionary of American Biography* which is now being produced by sound American scholarship.

Richard J. Purcell

PRESENT-DAY DEMOCRACY AND ITS CRITICS

I assure you it is a great pleasure for me to be with you this evening. When I was invited to be present at your banquet and to say something when the time for speaking should arrive, I was told that you would be better pleased if I would confine my remarks to some topic of present-day interest. Since it was to be a body of history teachers that was to be addressed, I regarded this restriction as being proper enough, for, if I understand the situation rightly, history is no longer concerned chiefly with the past but chiefly with the present. So I accepted the invitation and promised that any speech that I might make would be kept strictly within the bonds of contemporaneity.

The selection of a topic was not easily made. This present-day world is a stupendous affair and when I turned to it for a theme I quickly found that I was embarrassed by my riches. Reaching into the big grab-bag I seized upon a bundle of subjects labeled "politics" and decided that it would furnish the theme for which I was seeking. But present-day politics is also a stupendous affair and there was still an embarrassment of riches. Some of the political topics which presented themselves for consideration I was compelled to pass over because I did not have the temerity to grapple with the questions involved in their discussion. I drew back from the great questions of war and peace and world organization because I could not understand why a solemn renunciation of war should be taken as a signal for nations to burnish up their shooting-irons. Nor could I fully grasp the nature of the relation that statesmen propose to establish between ourselves and the World Court, for it seemed virtually to imply a relation which makes it possible for us to sit in the Court and at the same time stand outside it. I passed over the subject of party politics because I was badly confused when I compared certain phases of current political philosophy with current political practice. On the hustings and in all public places we hear shouting for the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln, while in the privacy of the polling-booths everybody seems to be on the side of Hamilton. And why should

we be urged with so much fervor to support the two-party system as the best of all party alignments when the practical effect of such support is to prolong indefinitely the life of a one-party system? Farm-relief was avoided because I could not see how the evils of over-production could be remedied by making production more profitable. When I came to the subject of prohibition, my mind ran up into all sorts of blind alleys and at last retired in defeat. But the grab-bag venture was not wholly disappointing. One of the subjects in the political parcel was Present-day Democracy. Here was promise; here was hope. When I saw the word "democracy" my heart leaped up as did Wordsworth's when he beheld a rainbow in the sky, for I might as well say that I am what Jefferson would have called a constitutional democrat; that is to say, I am a democrat in my bones. I lean up against democracy in implicit, loving reliance, and accept its doctrines in their entirety: the absolute supremacy of the people, universal suffrage, popular primaries, and those triune sisters, the initiative, referendum and recall. Democracy may be an experiment, but it is "a noble experiment" and I want to see it succeed. Some of you may be inclined to smile at this beautiful faith but do not deride a man because he allows the element of faith to enter into his political convictions. James Anthony Froude—if I may be pardoned for mentioning the name of a man who was born before the year 1889—tells us that "politics, like religion, are matters of faith in which reason says as little as possible", and, to my way of thinking he comes pretty close to the heart of the matter. So be prepared to listen to a few words about present-day democracy uttered by a man who walks in the faith, "believing where he cannot prove". I am quite enthusiastic about the subject and would like to take it stated in its broadest terms and dwell upon it all night, but as no arrangements have been made to meet the exigencies that might arise during the delivery of such an extended discourse, I must narrow the range of discussion. So brushing aside a great many things let us hasten to our muttons.

Oddly enough, our muttons is a goat and a scapegoat at that. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them at

the head of the goat." I quote these words of Holy Writ because I am going to interpret the subject announced on the program as if it read: "The Congress of the United States and Its Critics", and am going to say something about the bad habit we have of making Congress our national scapegoat. I suppose a people must have a scapegoat of some kind. If not a man then it must be an institution. At present, having no longer in our midst an outstanding personage powerful enough to bear the weight of all our transgressions we have selected Congress as the goat that must bear our iniquities. In parlors, in casual conversation over the walnuts, in magazines, in newspapers, upon the rostrum and upon the stage, there is so much railing and scolding at Congress, it is subjected to so much innuendo and invective, that on the surface one might suppose that one of the pastimes of the American people is to bespatter their great representative body with abuse.

Is this abuse deserved? After what I have said about my faith in democracy I can hardly be expected to answer this question in the affirmative. Happily the interests of truth do not require that it be answered in that way. For twenty-seven years I have lived here in Washington and have had an opportunity to learn something about Congress. I have made the acquaintance of a great many of its members, have had not a few of them as my friends and have followed the proceedings of the House and Senate with considerable fidelity. Thus, although an outsider, through a long span of years I have had a rather close view of the inside. During this period of observation not once has it been said of a Congress that it was composed of a body of inferior men, not once have I heard of a corrupt Congress, not once have we had a scandal of any kind in Congressional circles, charges of peculation and fraud on the part of members have been practically unknown, and of the thousands of Representatives and Senators who have been upon the scene, only two or three have gone astray. I cannot in one minute state the impressions acquired in more than a quarter of a century, but I can say that I have always felt that in the case of Congress at least, democracy is justified of its children. So "that bunch on the hill", a pet name for Congress here in Washington, will be glad to know, if by some strange chance the information should reach it, that it has at least one friend in the world.

Of course much of the jeering and scoffing to which I am referring is idle and meaningless and need not be taken seriously. But not all of it is thoughtless and irresponsible chatter. Not a little of it is founded upon real hostility and does harm because it comes from places of power and influence. Men bent upon schemes of exploitation may be counted upon to throw mud at Congress if it stands in the way of their plans, especially if they are plans of a shady or nefarious character. Usually the criticism from a source like this is not a one-sided affair: most likely the exploiter has criticized Congress because it has first criticized him. For Congress is an organ of censorship as well as an organ of legislation. And it is in its capacity as a national censor that it renders some of its most valuable services. At a time when its legislative output is small and unimportant, its criticisms based on the investigations of its committees may affect profoundly the mind of the nation and in the end produce results that no statute could even pretend to achieve. Of this a striking illustration is afforded by contemporary history. During the last six years, if we except two revenue laws that virtually enacted themselves in automatic fashion, we may say quite accurately that only one law of national importance was signed by the President and that was a law that was dictated by calamity rather than by policy. And yet how fruitful were the Congressional investigations of those years! How salutary was their influence upon public opinion! How clearly they brought out the fact that the legislative branch of the federal government is the branch that must be relied upon to uncover rascality and to cause the rascals to be visited with the detestation they deserve! No, it is not to be expected that Congress will escape the censure of men whom it has thwarted in their schemes for using the national government as an instrument for the promotion of their rapacity. And there is another class that will always be saying bad things about Congress. This class is composed of people who are against it on general principles, who refuse it their countenance simply because it is an institution of democracy, a form of government to which they have a deep-seated repugnance. Among such people are a few Communists who hate democracy because it does not promise that one day it will sweep away the rights of property, and not a few rich men who look askance at it because they are afraid that one day it will sweep

away the rights of property. This concern of the rich for their property is no new thing. When the workers of England began to demand the ballot Macaulay was seized with a fit of political shivers. In a speech on the floor of Parliament he predicted that if universal suffrage should be established in England all the fences that protect property would be broken down and that there would be "one vast spoliation". "One vast spoliation!" he exclaimed, repeating the words. Well, as the years rolled on the waves of democracy rolled higher and at last universal suffrage became an accomplished fact. A labor party came into power, but there was no spoliation. Ramsay McDonald exchanged his derby for a high silk hat and the British Empire was saved. I do not know and you do not know what the outcome of the experiment in democracy will be. For my part, I do not care to know; I seek not to penetrate the veil. But this I know and this you know, that if wars are to be fought in order to make the world safe for democracy, it ought to be *assumed* at least that democracy is safe for the world.

Returning to the critics, we come to those social engineers who worship at the shrine of efficiency. These regard Congress as a piece of cumbersome machinery ill-adapted to the performance of industrial regimentation and they would gladly throw it into the political scrap-heap into which they wish democracy itself might be thrown. With babbling, wrangling Congressmen out of the way they could go ahead and build up a society in which everything is coordinated, consolidated, merged, standardized and driven; a society in which every particular person is assigned to the task which he is best fitted to perform and is spurred on to work at topmost speed and do his level best every day and every hour of his efficient life. And it is on the ruins of democracy that this beautiful edifice is to be erected. "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, how often I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen has gathered her chickens under her wing and ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."

I have called your attention to these critics because their influence is subversive and because I want to put you on your guard against it. For it is an insidious influence and is capable of doing much harm. It is all right of course, indeed it is often a duty, to apply the lash of criticism to individual Senators and Representatives, but when men attack Congress as an institution with the

view of undermining it or destroying it they ought at least to know what they are doing. And what are they doing? They are lifting up a broad-axe which, if their ideas should prevail, will be buried deep in the brain of American democracy. For, make no mistake about it, the hope of American democracy is not the President of the United States, nor the Supreme Court of the United States, but the Congress of the United States. Draw out that bolt and the whole machinery falls to pieces. To be sure, no sane person could believe that the bolt will ever be removed, but the people by withdrawing from Congress their confidence and support, could reduce it to such a state of impotency that it might as well be non-existent. While it was falling in popular esteem it would more and more become a convenient rubber-stamp for the President's use, just as the Mexican Congress has always been a rubber-stamp for the President of that unhappy nation. Reduce our Congress to this low condition and the heart of America would cease to beat. The President, clothed as he would be with more power than has ever been given to any other mortal that has ever lived, would of necessity either rule as an autocrat or would himself be ruled by a stupendous governmental machine and the United States would rapidly evolve into a military barracks and a plantation just as twenty years ago Germany was fast becoming a military barracks and a plantation. That we are already moving in the direction of a federal bureaucracy is a statement that we hear every day by responsible men who are at the center of things. If they are right the movement ought to be checked without delay. And who will check it? There is no power on earth to stay it except the people acting through their representatives in Congress. If the people will say to their Senators and Representatives that the thing shall not be, it will not be. If the people should be indifferent and should do nothing about the matter the bureaucracy may be expected to march on from one victory to another. For, in things political as well as in things economic, concentration is the order of the day. Under prevailing conditions it is as natural for power to flow toward the executive branch of government as it is for water to flow down hill. So if a sharp clash should arise between that branch and Congress our critics would be in gleeful mood, for they would see the object of their aversion engaged in a conflict in which all the odds would be against it. What would be the mood of the people

at large? Would they think of the contest in terms of democracy and decide in favor of Congress? I would like to believe that they would, for the decision would mean a triumph not only for democracy but for liberty as well, and that would be enough for me. At that word "liberty" I am constrained again to refer my sensation to the incident of Wordsworth and his rainbow. If I am an incorrigible idealist on the subject of democracy it is only because I am an incorrigible idealist on the subject of liberty. Democracy and liberty are inseparables whereas autocracy and liberty are incompatibles. When Mussolini announced his program he said: "Democracy is played out and liberty is dead." It had to be that way. He could not have democracy dead and liberty alive. It has been through democracy that men have become free, and it will be by democracy that their freedom will be maintained. I am a democrat because I believe that the ballot is the only institution that can protect me from the tyrant and assure me that I will not be deprived of my freedom. If you should ask me to define freedom I would not attempt to comply with your request. For liberty is a divine gift bestowed only upon those who make themselves worthy of it by being true to the nobler impulses and longings of their nature. If these impulses and longings are in your breast you know what liberty is. If they are not there a definition would be useless. I will condescend, so far, however, as to call your attention to that inscription there on the façade of our Union Station:

> Sweetener of hut and of hall,
> Bringer of life out of naught;
> Freedom, the fairest of all
> The daughters of time and of thought.

SAMUEL E. FORMAN

PRESENT TREND OF SOCIAL STUDIES

The assignment to select and define trends in the teaching of social studies presents difficulties. It is almost a matter of professional ethics with historians not to engage in prophecy, and determining trends borders dangerously upon this forbidden ground. I was much happier in the subject of my other talk to this Association—I was able to confine myself to the discussion of conditions.

Furthermore, I feel considerable diffidence in talking to this Association on any phase of the teaching problem. There are so many in the audience better qualified than I am to discuss such topics both as teachers and as theorists.

How does one determine trends? In many fields of activity the determination of trends is a vital and practical necessity. The industrial corporation which establishes its policies upon the prospective increase or decrease of raw materials and consumption; the financial bureaus which study the stock market and advise their clients on the basis of trends noted; the clothing manufacturers whose success is dependent upon their response to the trend of style—these are all examples. In a general way the determination of trends is a factor in all active concerns of life. But it would be quite easy to show that there is not a certain method of determining trends in any of these fields and that this uncertainty increases rapidly as you move from the material elements to the psychological or human elements in the problem. And our subject is essentially human—and, more than that, the relations of humans with humans. Determination of trends under the circumstances is highly speculative, doubly so. I am therefore left in a serious dilemma. Either I proceed cautiously and tell you what you already know—or I venture recklessly and mislead you with conjectures none of which may come true.

The only basis on which I can speak is that of a teacher of history who for some time past has had to deal with the variety of developments taking place in that teaching over the country as a whole. The first and most obvious observation is to call your attention

to the one law of history which Professor Robinson stated in the preface of his history of Western Europe or the six laws which Professor Cheyney so brilliantly expounded at Columbus in his presidential address. These are stated in general terms and without limits of time or place. The persons capable of applying those general principles or laws to the specific problems of the curriculum in history teaching today will find it profitable. But, of course, you are familiar with this.

Another contribution of a similar kind might be made by calling attention to one of the earliest seminars in history in this country. I am referring to the seminar conducted by Herbert Baxter Adams at Johns Hopkins which devoted itself to the task of turning out scholars who were also teachers. From that seminar issued J. Franklin Jameson, C. H. Haskins and F. J. Turner; likewise Woodrow Wilson and the two Willoughbys, R. T. Ely, J. R. Commons, and several other distinguished economists; A. W. Small and several other sociologists. That seminar was, I believe, a history seminar.

Time passed and the numerous progeny of that seminar begot prolifically, each in his own field of special interest, until the grandchildren became so highly specialized that they lost all recognition of relationship. This caused little distress and much good as long as each was pushing the frontiers of his own special interest forward. Then came the time for taking inventory of the advance to organize this material for the general benefit of mankind through the schools. This brought the social sciences together once more—at first as strangers and for a time in no friendly fashion, as each more or less claimed to be doing the same thing. You may recall the stages in this process of re-acquaintance. Much of the drama was enacted in your region. For the past four years persons prominent in the main social science fields have been working together without friction on the problems of the schools. The Commission now directing the investigation of the social studies in the schools is so composed.

This seems a long story—too long for you who are already familiar with it and probably not long enough to make its import clear to those who are not so familiar with its development. But it may reveal a trend. There has been some criticism of the title of this Commission on "History and the Other Social Studies

in the Schools''. That title is the outgrowth of the development just noted and indicates: (1) that history is a social study concerned with the relation of people with each other and (2) that there is a relationship between the social studies, and (3) that the social sciences have a contribution to make to the schools. This development is further confirmed by the recent tendency among writers and teachers of history to include all phases of society, not merely the political, in their treatment of history. Perhaps, then, it is possible to say that there is a trend to include in the school course some of the results of the great advance made in the social sciences in recent years.

I fear, however, that I have labored over an observation with which you are probably more familiar than I am. And now I shall have to add another—probably equally familiar. There has been a great amount of experimentation both in matter and method in our field. Curiously enough, this has been greatest at the junior high school level, next at the junior college level, relatively little in the senior high school or elementary grades. Doubtless the recent development of separate administrative units at those levels accounts for the greater activity there, though the grades themselves have been in existence quite as long as the others. The nature of this experimentation, especially at the junior high school level, has been amazing. I know that many veteran teachers of history have been perplexed by the educational theory which seemed to justify the study of problems of society and international organization or processes underlying the operation of society by children of eleven, twelve, and thirteen when youth three to five years older had found matters much less complex or abstract quite difficult if not sometimes impossible. Some teachers were highly critical of such attempts, while others restrained the criticism which they felt, thinking that some new-found wisdom had arisen to achieve the marvel they had struggled for in vain. That experimentation is now quite old and its results are available with important lessons for us all. In the course of it and the general discussion surrounding it there has appeared a tendency to emphasize a closer connection between the classroom discussion of society and society itself. It has brought into sharper relief a problem which most teachers of history have known about but comparatively few have achieved. Society

seems to demand of all teachers in our field the ability to achieve what may be characterized as a minor miracle—the transformation of inanimate printing into the semblance of real human activity. The mere use of stage-craft doesn't accomplish it nor does a highly dramatic recital in print achieve it. Such devices may create a temporary illusion and entertain, but they do not confer a sustained sense of reality. The interposition of the teacher is still the vital element. Perhaps I can bring this point to a close by suggesting that there is a distinct trend to require a closer relationship between the classroom and life itself. Again, there is nothing strikingly new about this.

I do not mean to imply that the extenisve experimentation of these levels has confined itself to this one point. It has, of course, dealt with nearly all aspects of our teaching problem from the selection and organization of subject matter to methods of procedure and pedagogical devices. Educational research has stimulated a more definite and precise quest for results in our field as in many others. Perhaps our field needs it most—owing to the intangible values which we seek. Too often we have assumed results because the pupils were exposed to the material we thought brought those results. There is a test which any of you might repeat. Take a fact test on any field of history—one which samples the main topics—and apply it to pupils who have just completed a year's work and a group of average pupils who have crammed text and reference books for a week. I think you will agree with me after trying it that such a test does not measure the real values gained through instruction in this field.

This penetrating quest for real values has disclosed another peculiarity of our subjects. Many terms and concepts which we employ are not simple but have cumulative value. We use such terms as democracy, society, state, and the like constantly. A fourth grade pupil can be taught a dictionary definition. But we are scarcely content to have a twelfth grade pupil or a college sophomore satisfied with a fourth grader's knowledge of democracy or society or state. Unfortunately, the terms remain the same at every level and pupils have been known to greet the term at the next level as something they already know. It may even be possible that our adult society is full of persons who have only a fourth grader's understanding of some of the terms we use. Per-

haps we can recognize here another trend—a more precise identification of specific values in our field and an insistence upon their attainment.

Then if we take another preoccupation of educational research, the study of individual differences, we may recognize another trend. That there are marked differences in ability among members of the same class and that these differences justify separate treatment is now axiomatic. Its corollary, that the best pupils are not adequately treated under a standard of minimum requirements for the class as a whole, is almost as generally accepted. Nowhere is this more true then at the senior high school and junior college levels in which least study has been made. The past ten years have witnessed a transformation at those levels. Now the great majority of pupils continue beyond the junior high school. The result is that the average of ability in senior high school classes has tended to drop lower and lower as those classes tend to have a completely normal distribution of ability. At those levels the range of capacity within a single class becomes so wide that it is almost impossible any longer to meet the needs of all with a single text-book. Some veteran text-book writers have been driven almost frantic by the demands to provide at one and the same time for all ranges of ability. It is significant that one of the more widely used new procedures no longer relies upon a common text. There would seem to be, therefore, a trend to provide adequately for the widening range of ability in the upper grades by the use of a wider range of books.

Speaking of books, it was one of the members of this Association who first called to the attention of the profession the fact that there are different kinds of reading—not just reading. I believe he identified five different types. Since that time psychological research has fully confirmed that view and has indicated that the number of different types may be even greater and their use a matter of even more precise diagnosis. One book may contain several types of reading. There is nothing in this which the good teacher has not felt more or less consciously in dealing with pupils, but the trend is now definitely to recognize such differences in reading matter and to prescribe the different kinds where best adapted. It is no longer sufficient to identify a book as scholarly or not scholarly, nor as adapted to children or only

for teachers. The tools for classification of reading are already much more refined and it is hoped that the investigation now in progress will result in the discovery of a set of guiding principles in the selection of reading materials.

But let me bring this trend-hunting to a close. I have touched upon phases of objectives, of material, of organization of material and methods of procedure. I have not emphasized the trend toward the greater use of tests for diagnostic purposes because you are thoroughly familiar with that trend. I fear, as I stated at the outset, that I have told you nothing true which you didn't already know and, if I have told you something new, it probably isn't true. This audience is scarcely one to whose knowledge of the teaching of history I can hope to contribute.

Let me speak of one other matter, however, before I close. The national investigation of history and the other social studies is now under way. What can the teachers do to help that along? Many of you, I know, are willing to coöperate in the administration of tests and the like. But there is much you can do without waiting for requests from the working organization.

The investigation will undoubtedly involve a critical inventory of what is now being done and will likewise canvass the possibility of doing some things not now done which ought to be done.

The Commission directing this investigation is a critical one. It is composed to insure the presentation of every pertinent element in the problem. It is quite unlikely that it will be beguiled by the merely plausible or accept sham values. Its members are all intensely interested and will give a sympathetic hearing to any sincere and informed opinions.

The first concern is naturally about objectives and it will undoubtedly issue lists of objectives from time to time. The tentative list drawn up by the planning committee and reprinted in the October number of the *American Historical Review* and the February number of the *Historical Outlook* may be taken as the first of those lists. As those lists appear the teachers can render a real service by analyzing their own courses and noting the extent to which the material and method of those courses contribute to the attainment of such objectives.

If you feel that any particular subject matter or any particular method helps to attain any of those objectives better than any

other, send that information to the Commission without waiting for a request from them.

If you are certain that some matter or method recommended to achieve certain ends fails to achieve those ends, send that on to the Committee.

If you are fairly certain that your community presents problems of a peculiar nature for the teacher of history and other social studies, send that information on to the Commission. It may be the means of disclosing and ultimately solving fundamental problems in our field.

Or if you feel that the Commission may overlook some vital phase of the teaching problem, send that on.

All such communications will be received with gratitude by the Commission and acknowledgment will be made of any such help received.

Let me add a caveat. I know the tendency to feel that some thought or observation is probably well known to the Commission. You would be amazed at the number of individual items which are not constantly in the minds of either the commission or its working staff. Don't hesitate to include such items in your letter and if it does happen to be something they happen to know, your repetition of it will help to emphasize its importance. So do write.

Address:
A. C. KREY
316 Library
Univ. of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minn.
New York office
610 Fayerweather Hall
Columbia University
N. Y. C.

The chief value of this investigation lies in the opportunity it affords us as teachers to help ourselves by helping each other.

THE FALL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

English Liberals, if they can summon enough grim humor, may reply to talk of the death of the party as Mark Twain responded to rumor of his demise—by saying that the report is considerably exaggerated. To party members, to the neutral observer, and even to an opponent of the party, there is something almost incredible in the idea that its day is done. Its day has been so long and so brilliant that even its enemies must wonder whether the present dimness is its twilight or the mere shadow of a passing cloud.

Its dawn of power was the Glorious Revolution almost two centuries and a half ago. Among its heroes are William III and Marlborough, Whigs in spite of themselves; Walpole and his ally, the Duke of Newcastle, prince of eighteenth-century politicians; the elder Pitt, "the first of Englishmen"; the prodigal but great-hearted Charles James Fox; Lord Grey and John Russell of the Reform Bill; Palmerston the irrepressible; Gladstone, the leonine figure, the grand old man, four times prime minister; and giants of late memory, as the philosophical Morley, the ingratiating and civilized Asquith, and Lloyd George, the barbarian from Wales, too shifty in the view of some for the rôle of hero but formidable none the less. Nor has the party hidden the light of its greatness, as witness the roll call of the great historians—among them, Bishop Stubbs, who has been described as an unconscious Whig, Macauley, who gloried in his bias, Lecky, and Green, and Morley, and the Trevelyans. Surely reports of the party's demise, as of the death of Mark Twain, are exaggerated. Surely, in any case, like the king, it has an heir, so that loyal Liberals can at least console themselves by saying, "The Liberal party is dead. Long live the Liberal party!"

Whatever may be one's views or personal sympathies, the election figures are impressive. In 1906 the party secured 378 seats in the House of Commons and received the support of Nationalists and Laborites. The Conservatives (then called Unionists) commanded only 156 votes. The Liberals, after

their victory, put through an unparalleled program of social legislation. Then the party launched upon the tempestuous currents of the World War, and out of these currents it emerged so mauled and battered that it was not even His Majesty's Opposition. Out of 615 seats in the House of Commons, it controlled, in the election of 1924, only 42 seats.*

Why the fall of the Liberal party? Some are inclined to view the party as the greatest casualty of the Great War. Those who would vindicate the Liberal war policy explain that the party was a sacrifice to a noble cause. Critics of the war policy, on the other hand, contend that the party was a faithless steward, justly punished for an unjust war and a vindictive peace. Others, inclined to accept the great-man theory of history, look for the cause of the party's fall in the duel of the giants in the party, Asquith and Lloyd George. While the Liberal dogs were fighting for power, the Conservative dog ran away with the bone of His Majesty's Government and the Labor dog ran away with the bone of His Majesty's Opposition.

These explanations have only a superficial validity and are at best but indications of contributory causes. Even admitting that the report of the party's death is premature, the diagnosis indicates that its malady is a vital functional disorder, threatening mortality. Its one essential function has been to serve as the party of initiative, the agency of readjustment and change. It has now surrendered that function, on which its own vitality depends, to the Labor party. From a brief historical analysis of the rôles that parties have played in England, the point of view will become apparent.

A party as distinguished from a faction is a relatively stable group, more or less permanently organized, and with some degree of continuity and consistency of policies. As proponents or opponents of great national policies the historic Liberal and Conservative parties go back to the seventeenth century. Even in methods of party discipline there is some evidence of continuity. Probably the most essential instrument of party discipline is the

*This paper was read on the eve of the election of May 30, 1929, at which election the Labor party became the leading party, virtually destroyed the Liberal party, and assumed a strategic position which seems to make inevitable an ultimate majority.

whip, and whips by any other name may be as efficacious. As far back as 1666, when a measure in parliament displeased the Court party (forerunner of the modern Conservative party), the Lord Chamberlain was ordered "to send to the play houses and brothels to bid all the parliament men that were there to go to the parliament presently". The measure in question was a bill for creating a committee to audit the king's expenditures for the Dutch war. "This hath a most sad face," we read further, "and will breed very ill blood." Controversies of the kind here mentioned bred parties as well as ill blood.

People nowadays view party issues with a good deal of seriousness—especially when party leaders are bold enough to embrace such issues as prohibition or socialism. But the fateful nature of public problems weighs upon us far less heavily than it burdened the minds of seventeenth-century Englishmen. The outstanding politcal question was, Which shall prevail, hereditary monarchy or the representative system of government? "In all Christian kingdoms," said a member of the House of Commons in 1626, "you know that parliaments were in use anciently, until the monarchs began to know their own strength, . . . and little by little began to stand upon their prerogatives, and at last overthrew the parliaments throughout Christendom except only here with us." But even in England the Tudor absolutism and the divine-right monarchy of James I and Charles I left parliament with little power.

Then, as in other ages, there were those who favored the maintenance of the *status quo* and there were those who attempted a policy of change and readjustment. Peculiar circumstances in the seventeenth century led to the organization of these two natural groups into parties and to the transfer of political authority from ministers acting as agents of the king to ministers responsible to the stronger party. Those who acquiesced in the exercise of the royal authority or actively favored it came to be known by the end of the seventeenth century as Tories. Those who believed in checking the king's power and in bringing about the ascendancy of parliament acquired the name of Whigs.

Tories as well as Whigs were dissatisfied with James II because he was a Catholic. But the transition from royal to parliamentary

government was distinctively the work of the Whigs. The first modern cabinet was the Whig Junto of the reign of William and Mary. The first prime minister was the Whig chieftain, Robert Walpole. By statutory enactment, and especially by usages which acquired the nature of precedents and the force of laws, the parliamentary revolution begun by Eliot and Coke and Pym and Hampden and other parliament men of the early Stuart period was completed by the Whigs of the quarter century extending from the Revolution of 1688 to the Hanoverian Succession of 1714.

There were Tories who continued to pledge their loyalty to divine-right monarchy by drinking toasts to "the king over the water". The Whigs successfully discredited the Tories as being Jacobites unwilling to recognize the parliamentary title of the Hanoverians to the throne. But in spite of all this the Tories generally bowed to the inevitable and recognized the power of parliament as being, in fact if not in theory, above the prerogative of the crown.

In the meantime another issue had arisen. With the settlement of the outstanding questions that had disturbed their minds in the seventeenth century, Englishmen began to turn their attention and their energies increasingly into commercial and imperial channels. The aristocracy had always been predominantly a landed class. But many landlords had come to be interested in trade and colonization. The chartered companies numbered among their subscribers and sometimes among their officers many noblemen and knights and gentlemen. Such members of the aristocracy were in accord with the merchants in promoting public policies favorable to commercial and imperial expansion. They were almost invariably Whigs. The result was an informal alignment of the mercantile interests of the towns and the commercially inclined elements of the aristocracy. Those noblemen who were more closely associated with the land were in favor of a more insular policy, with emphasis on the interests of the landed classes. These noblemen were supported by most of the country gentlemen, and by high-churchmen, particularly strong in the country, just as low-churchmen and dissenters, who were strong in the towns, were generally Whig in sentiment.

So by the time the question of the royal prerogative *versus* parliamentary government was settled, another issue, insular landlordism *versus* commercial expansion, had arisen. The navigation laws were revised and new enforcement machinery was created. The debased coinage was called in and replaced by a standardized currency. The Bank of England, in the face of long-continued Tory opposition, was established and maintained as a central reservoir of resources for large-scale trading operations and loans to the government. The government's principal need of money was in connection with the succession of wars beginning in 1690. These wars were preeminently for commercial and imperial expansion. The first phase came to an end in 1713 with the Treaty of Utrecht. Marlborough, the Tory military genius, had to abandon the Tories and become a Whig in order to find support for his war policy.

The Whigs, gaining ascendancy in connection with the Hanoverian Succession, continued the policies of mercantilism, balance of power, and the extension of trade and empire by means of war. Such policies proved to be popular. So thoroughly discredited were the Tories that the Whigs long had no consistent party opposition. Their chief difficulty was the harmonizing of internal factions. The party degenerated into a system of patronage and parliamentary management dominated by the Newcastle machine. Finally, in the reign of George III, the Newcastle machine was disrupted by the simple process of the transfer of patronage to the "king's friends".

Out of the mid-century confusion there emerged by 1770 a stable parliamentary majority. This was first commanded by Lord North as the agent of the king, and later by Pitt the Younger, who restored the parliamentary system by freeing himself from royal domination. Pitt was the founder of a new Tory party. Even before the French Revolution, Pitt stood not for a new departure in politics (though he paid lip service to reform) but rather for stabilization on the basis of the Whig principles established before the riot of factionalism and the orgy of government by the king's friends. When the French Revolution broke out, Pitt soon revealed the dominant trait of his character and his administration. The Tory party under him till his death in 1806 and for a quarter of a century after his death, maintained itself in

power because of its support of imperialistic policies distinctively Whig in origin and because of its ardent devotion to the existing order in domestic affairs. From 1789 to 1822 the one important law involving a serious innovation was the abolition of the slave trade, and this was largely due to the influence of the leader of the Whigs, Charles James Fox. The result of inaction was a vast accumulation of abuses and maladjustments In 1822 the group known paradoxically but justly as the Liberal Tories came into office with their eyes open to the fact that the tide was turning toward reform—or, if that were denied, toward revolution.

But the Liberal Tories were determined that reform should not extend to the parliamentary system. The system had been established by the Whigs in spite of Tory opposition. Now the Tories were determined to maintain it unaltered in the face of Whig demands for alteration. These demands were for extension of the franchise and equalization of representation. Thus emerged the next decisive issue—political democracy *versus* rule by the aristocracy. The result is the familiar story of the Great Reform Bill of 1832 ("the greatest act of the century") and the later reforms of parliament, together with the vast mass of reform legislation by the reformed parliaments. In essence these changes democratized the representative system and applied to business, with discreet exceptions, the liberating principle of *laissez-faire.*

The Tories fell from power in 1830 because of their opposition to these changes. They continued to oppose such policies till the current became too strong for them. Peel went over to free trade, and was denounced by his fellow Tory, Disraeli, as a party traitor. But Disraeli himself later disgusted many of his colleagues by making his famous "leap in the dark" in favoring the reform of parliament in 1867. By this time the Tories were called Conservatives; and the Whigs, Liberals. Disraeli was primarily an imperialist—but imperialism, no less than political reform, had been originally a Whig policy opposed by the Tories.

The country at last grew tired of Gladstone's reforming zeal. The Liberal ministers themselves grew weary in what at least to them was well doing, and applicable again was Disraeli's earlier

description of the Liberal ministerial bench as "a range of extinct volcanoes". Particularly dissatisfied were many Liberals with Gladstone's efforts to extend home rule to Ireland. After the Liberal schism of 1886, the Conservatives, aided by the Liberal Unionists, were able to maintain themselves in power, with a brief interval, for about twenty years. Again the party proved itself to be devoted to the established order. It accepted the new system of parliamentary representation, the democratic franchise, individualism and *laissez-faire*, and especially imperialism, all originally sponsored by the Liberals or Whigs. Its power resulted from the breach in the Liberal ranks, from a popular feeling of opposition to further reform measures ,and from the revival of imperialistic sentiment which Disraeli had fostered and which he and his successors capitalized.

Then came the last era of Liberal rule, beginning in 1905. The nineteenth century had removed the fetters from business, torn down the walls of the old protective system, and transformed the representative system into a political democracy. But somehow the anticipated results were not being realized. Industrial accidents, unemployment, old age unprovided for, poverty, and social discontent were problems ever more insistently demanding solution. Doubts arose as to the beneficence of *laissez-faire* and of individualism and unrestricted competition. Skeptics questioned the optimism of Browning's "God's in his heaven, all's right with the world".

"There are hundreds of thousands of men, women and children in this country," said Lloyd George, "now enduring hardships for which the sternest judge would not hold them responsible." Where, then, shall responsibility be placed? *Laissez-faire* economists and Liberal statesmen after Adam Smith and Thomas Malthus agreed that economic laws accounted for such conditions and believed that governmental intervention was worse than useless. Was this nineteenth-century view of the Liberals valid? Yes, was the reply of twentieth-century Conservative leaders; no, was the response of the new Liberal leaders. Responsibility for the dangers of modern industrial society must be assumed, said Lloyd George and his Liberal colleagues, by society as a whole, that is to say, by the government.

Thus again the Liberal party became the party of initiative and social readjustment. The new issue was social responsibility *versus* individualism. The party put into effect a comprehensive system of social legislation for protecting the workers against the dangers of modern industrial society—employers' liability for accidents and industrial diseases; old-age pensions; minimum wage laws; insurance against illness and against unemployment; and a new tax policy which took into account not only the amount of one's wealth but also the way one got it.

These measures the Conservatives opposed as they had opposed the primacy of parliament, the subordination of agriculture to trade and imperialism, the democratizing of the representative system, and the democratic and *laissez-faire* reforms of the nineteenth century. But the principle of social responsibility having been carried into effect in the Liberal legislation of 1906 to 1914, the Conservatives accepted it as they earlier accepted parliamentary ascendancy, political democracy, and individualism.

In England as in America, after the World War the war-weary voters were dominated by a desire for "normalcy" and a spirit of acquiescence in the established order. Conditions were made to order for the Conservatives. Again, as in former eras of Tory and Conservative rule, they have made no move to initiate any far-reaching change or readjustment. To be sure, they have favored a return to protection; but this is in reality a reversion to what was formerly the good Whig doctrine of mercantilism.

In championing and maintaining the established order, the Conservatives are unrivaled. Successful opposition must be based, as in the past, on a policy of initiative and readjustment. But the Liberals, by their own past policies, have unwittingly maneuvered themselves into a position in which they have lost the power of initiative. In the evolution of English society since the industrial revolution, the Liberals have taken the lead in democratizing the parliamentary system, in the elimination of innumerable abuses and maladjustments on the basis of individualism and *laissez-faire*, and finally in the abandonment of *laissez-faire* and individualism in favor of social legislation based on the principle of social responsibility. What else can they propose, unless it is either a return to

nineteenth-century individualism and *laissez-faire*, or else a going forward to socialism?

Practically, they are unable to return to the older individualism. Its acceptance by any considerable proportion of voters is inconceivable. The idea of their adopting socialism recalls Mrs. Barthwick's remonstrance with her husband in Galsworthy's *Silver Box*. Barthwick is a Liberal member of parliament, and is perturbed by his wife's suggestion, at the breakfast table, that Liberals and Conservatives ought to get together and nip in the bud the plans of the socialists. "Now, John, eat your breakfast. As if there were any real difference between you and the Conservatives. All the upper classes have the same interests to protect, and the same principles."

That is the dilemma of the Liberal party. Its history, its traditions, its interests, are overwhelmingly of the upper classes. Its championing of political democracy was truly for itself a leap in the dark. Political democracy necessitated, in turn, a policy of social legislation demanded by the enfranchised workers. Social legislation based on social responsibility has proved to be fruitful chiefly in a demand for the logical next step. If government is to be responsible for the dangers of modern industrial society, it must have virtually complete control of industry. But such a degree of control is illogical, impracticable, essentially impossible without possession. What the owners of wealth wish to do, the whole power of wealth will do, either through the law or else in defiance of the law. Thus wrote Emerson the philosopher, echoing the common-sense knowledge of the every-day observer. In last analysis the inevitable issues are private capitalism *versus* socialism.

As a political issue, the individualism of the days of *laissez-faire* is dead. Confronting socialism, the Liberal chieftains draw back in consternation. What remains? Nothing but playing a poor second fiddle to the Conservatives as defenders of private capitalism. Where Liberals feared to tread, the Laborites rushed in. Some think them knaves for doing so, but at least they were not fools. With them the hoary aristocratic traditions, the gigantic private fortunes, the vested interests in stocks and bonds and unearned increment, instead of being rallying points for defense as with the Liberals, are obstacles to be overcome.

Trade unionists, cooperatives, and socialist societies had long acted in concert for securing parliamentary representation. In 1918 they adopted a program definitely socialistic in character and rallied to their standard soon thereafter enough supporters to assume the rôle of His Majesty's Opposition, on the issue of socialized industry *versus* private industry. On this basic issue the Labor party stands where the Liberals and their predecessors for two hundred and fifty years have stood as the party of initiative and social readjustment.

WITT BOWDEN

SUMMARY OF FATHER WALSH'S ADDRESS ON SOVIET RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES

Father Walsh began his address by stating that, instead of dealing with the present relations between Soviet Russia and the United States, he had decided to modify his subject and discuss some purely historical considerations concerning the fall of the Russian Empire.

It was just twelve years ago that one of the greatest empires of history fell. The downfall of its autocratic government had become a physical necessity. This government formed the last outstanding anachronism of modern times. Russian society, before the revolution, took the form of an inverted pyramid. The upper section of it consisted of peasants, 80% of whom were illiterate, and many of whom were discontented and showed revolutionary tendencies. There was practically no middle class. The whole upper section of the pyramid was balanced on the apex, consisting of the autocracy and bureaucracy. The latter were broken down by the war. When the apex crumbled, it was inevitable that the whole pyramid should fall.

After discussing the size of the old Russian Empire, which, he pointed out, was twice as large as the whole of Europe or the United States, Father Walsh went on to deal with some of the antecedents of the downfall of that Empire. The Czar abdicated in March, 1917, at the little railroad station at Pskov, signing his abdication in his private car with a lead pencil—not, as later writers have claimed, at the Winter Palace with a pen. After his abdication, the Czar and his family were taken to the Summer Palace at Tsarskoe Selo, where they were imprisoned for some months. Later, they were transferred to Tobolsk. Here their imprisonment was at first mild, amounting merely to house detention. Then a mysterious incident occurred. There arrived upon the scene a man calling himself Vassili Vassilievitch Jakolev, who represented himself as having orders from the Bolshevist government, which by now was in power, to conduct the Czar, the Czarina

and one of the grand-duchesses to some other place. These members of the royal family left Tobolsk with him. Then began a game of hare and hounds. After having made several attempts to reach Moscow by special train and having had several different routes closed to him and his companions, Commissar Jakolev finally resigned at Ekaterinburg and left his royal charges in that town, where they were eventually joined by the other members of the family.

The puzzle of this mysterious mission of Comrade Jakolev has never been fully solved. Father Walsh put forward the hypothesis that Jakolev was an emissary from the Central Powers, commissioned to propose to the Czar that, if he would return to Moscow and sign the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, these powers would place his son Alexis on the throne and thus perpetuate the Romanoff dynasty. This theory seems to be supported by the testimony of the driver of the cart in which the Czar travelled during part of the journey after leaving Tobolsk. The driver testified that, although he could not hear what was being said, the Czar seemed to him to be refusing very decidedly certain proposals which Jakolev had made to him. It is also reported that, before they started that day, the Czarina had said that she knew what was wanted of her husband and that she would not permit him to sign the treaty. If this theory is true, the Russian royal family was thrown back into the hands of the Bolshevists in revenge for the Czar's failure to accept the propositions of the Central Powers.

The next event of importance was the murder of the royal family which took place in the basement of the house where they were imprisoned in Ekaterinburg shortly after midnight on the night of July 16, 1918. Father Walsh described the execution in detail. After the massacre, the bodies of the eleven victims were taken away from the village in trucks and burned in a deserted spot in a forest. Soldiers guarded the spot and the villagers were not allowed near the place for forty-eight hours. After the bodies were completely consumed, the ashes were thrown down the shaft of an old mine. Later on, these ashes were recovered and sifted and among them were found relics which seemed to prove definitely that all the members of the royal family had been disposed of by a wholesale assassination. These articles included broken eye-

glasses, false teeth, decorations worn only by members of the royal family, and six sets of corset steels. There had been six women in the party. It seems impossible that any of the members of the Romanoff family could have escaped, despite the fact that there is at present in New York a young woman who claims to be the former Grand Duchess Anastasia.

Going back to the causes of this wholesale massacre, Father Walsh said that he believed that the Czarina was more responsible for the debacle than any other individual. The Czarina had a great influence over the Czar, as is shown by the letters which passed between them. Her influence over him was, on the whole, unfortunate. She ignored the ground-swell of revolt and constantly opposed reforms. Her one idea was that the power of the Russian autocracy must be handed down to her son Alexis, the apple of her eye, intact. It has been said that a politician is one who keeps his eyes fixed on the next election, while a statesman keeps his fixed on the next generation. There were plenty of politicians in old Russia, but few statesmen. In this sense, the Czarina was a politician. It was owing to her great anxiety, which became almost an obsession with her, with regard to the health of her son that the unspeakable Rasputin attained his great influence at the Russian court. Alexis suffered from a disease known as haemophilia, which is quite common in the royal families of Europe and which causes the sufferer to bleed profusely as the result of a slight scratch or contusion. It is always inherited through the mother's family, but never by females. The Czarina felt that she was responsible for this illness of her son. Rasputin was the only one who seemed able to cure him. Several times the boy lay at death's door, but was revived by the seemingly miraculous power of this man.

There are two possible hypotheses which may account for Rasputin's power to heal the boy: (1) that he had some sort of hypnotic power, which enabled him to soothe and quiet the patient until nature could take its course and the bleeding stopped; this is the more probable theory and is supported by the testimony of a number of people, who testified that Rasputin seemed to possess such a power; (2) that Rasputin was in league with one of the ladies-in-waiting at the court, named Anna Viroubova. It is supposed that this woman, who was certainly connected with

Rasputin in an immoral way, administered an irritating Oriental drug to the Czarevitch to make him ill. This drug was perhaps supplied by a Siberian adventurer named Badmaiev. According to this theory, having administered the drug and made the boy ill, Madame Viroubova would send for Rasputin who would appear when the effects of the drug had begun to wear off and seem to cure the patient.

So great was Rasputin's influence over the Czarina that she yielded to his wishes, in political, as well as in other matters. The Grand Duke Nicholas was removed from the command of the army, as the result of a protest from Rasputin. Nicholas was the one man who might have saved Russia; with his removal the downfall of the empire became inevitable.

It has been well said that "men determine events and women influence men."

"For want of a nail, a shoe was lost.
For want of a shoe, a horse was lost.
For want of a horse, a rider was lost.
For want of a rider, a battle was lost.
For want of a battle, a kingdom was lost.
And all for the want of a horse-shoe nail."

ATLANTIC CITY MEETING

November 30, 1929

Saturday Morning, November 30, 10 o'clock, Venetian Room, Hotel Ambassador

ADDRESSES:

a. *"The Post-War Drift of Pan-Americanism,"* Professor Irving S. Kull, Rutgers University

b. *"German Versus Polish Nationalism—A Question of Treaty Revision,"* Professor Mary E. Townsend, Teachers College, Columbia University

Saturday Afternoon, November 30, 1 o'clock, Pompeiian Room, Hotel Ambassador

ADDRESS:

a. *"Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences,"* Dr. Isaiah Bowman, Director of the American Geographical Society

THE POST-WAR DRIFT OF PAN-AMERICANISM

The Monroe Doctrine and Pan-Americanism are two complementary policies of the United States for the Western Hemisphere. The former, which dates from 1823, is negative, as it raises a forbidding hand against Europe; the latter, which dates from the eighties of the last century, is positive as it seeks mutual benefit in the cooperative action of the twenty-one republics. Of all terms in the history of American foreign policy, none has so successfully evaded definition as Pan-Americanism and the dictionaries have done little more than add confusion. The international lawyer has sounded a phase of it. Pan-Americanism, says John Bassett Moore, "is obviously derived from the conception that there is such a thing as an American system"[1] in contradistinction to something European. And so with Drago who conceives of America as constituting a "separate political factor".

With thought to an American system, Mr. J. B. Lockey has distinguished six fundamental factors: an actual political independence from Europe, a community of political ideals, territorial integrity, resort to law instead of force, nonintervention by the American states as a body, equality of states in the conduct of their international union and cooperation in the promotion of their common interests.[2] Fairly distinctly these factors manifest themselves in such history as Pan-Americanism has had. But Pan-Americanism needs definition also in terms of sentiment: in the respect and confidence and affection which the American republics hold for one another and for the whole. The validity of Pan-Americanism must needs find expression in some common patriotism.

The subject of this paper invites a consideration then not only of the formal action of the American states as they meet in the periodical Conferences of the Pan-American Union but of the drift of thought and feeling as the history of the post-war years reveals it.

---

[1]J. B. Lockey, Pan-Americanism: its Beginnings, p. 31.
[2]Ibid., pp. 33-35.

From early days a certain sense of togetherness prevailed in the New World. This was due to common elements in the geography and history of our two continents. English American and Latin American shared a common continent and a common oceanic distance from Europe. Maia wrote to Jefferson: "Nature in making us inhabitants of the same continent has in some sort united us in the bonds of a common patriotism." Europe, moreover, was the common mother of us all and by revolutions we all attained our independence. We all clung to the same political philosophies and wrote them into the structure of our republican systems. With such commonalty, were we to stop short of hemispherical solidarity and "common patriotism"?

The term Pan-Americanism appears to have been first used by the New York *Evening Post*, March 5, 1888 apropos the conference of American Republics scheduled to meet in Washington the following year[3]. This conference was not the first effort to give expression to sentiments of solidarity but it was the beginning of what is known today as Pan-Americanism. The first important move was that taken by Bolivar culminating in the Panama Congress of 1826. But the scope of Bolivar's design was not Pan-American, only Spanish American. His invitations included neither the United States nor Brazil. Only later were invitations sent to Brazil and the United States. The Panama Congress was premature and accomplished nothing[4]. During the next half-century a number of other Latin American conferences were called but in no case was the United States invited. An all-American kinship was not yet a part of the Latin's sentiment or interest. In fact, Bolivar's heart seems to have been set upon building up of a great Hispanic American state or confederation under the powerful influence of Great Britain. He did not greatly rely upon any protection that the United States might afford nor accept the leadership in this hemisphere which was implied in President Monroe's message.[5] And the later

[3]Ibid., p. 2.

[4]Professor John H. Latané says failure of the United States delegates to arrive in large measure caused the failure of the Congress. This does not seem plausible in the light of the subsequent disorder in the Latin American states which must have prevented a successful execution of any conclusions that might have been reached at Panama. History of American Foreign Policy, p. 660.

[5]Lockey, op. cit., p. 250.

efforts to bring the Spanish American states together were in a measure prompted by a fear of Spain or the United States.[6]

The fears of the Yankee American state were lessened when its Civil War put an end to the land-grabbing ambitions of the slavocracy, and, as various of the Latin-American states at the end of the seventies were turning to arbitration to settle their disputes, the United States took the initiative in a program for all of the American republics. In 1881 James G. Blaine, then Secretary of State, issued an invitation to all the independent states of the Americas to meet in general congress in Washington. A change in the American government delayed the projected congress. A renewal of invitations by the Cleveland government did bring together a Pan-American congress in 1889, at which time Mr. Blaine was again Secretary of State.

In Blaine's mind there were two objectives as he set them down in 1882: "First, to bring about peace and prevent future wars in North and South America; second, to cultivate such friendly commercial relations with all American countries as would lead to a large increase in the export trade of the United States by supplying those fabrics in which we are abundantly able to compete with the manufacturing nations of Europe."[7] In other words, peace and commerce epitomized Blaine's ideas and peace was necessary to accomplish the commercial objectivea she declared. The economic interpreter of history may prefer to say that the commercial advantage of the United States was the motivation and that peace was only a tool. That this was true was feared by some of the Latin Americans. Señor Romero, the Mexican Minister at Washington, said that there was a general fear among the Latin Americans that the object of the Conference was "to secure the political and commercial ascendancy of the United States on the continent".[8] The thinking of Blaine was not a little like that of Coolidge and Hoover who see that war anywhere is prejudicial to American interests.

Among the subjects brought before the Conference of 1889 were the adoption of a customs union, the improvement of the means of

[6]Clarence H. Haring, South America Looks at the United States, p. 45.

[7]Lockey, op. cit., p. 4, quoting from the Chicago *Weekly Magazine*, Sept. 16, 1882.

[8]George H. Blakeslee, The Recent Foreign Policy of the United States, p. 132.

communication between the various countries, uniform customs regulation, a uniform system of weights and measures, laws for the protection of patents and copyrights, extradition, the adoption of a common silver coin and the formulation of a definite plan for international arbitration declaring that this means of settling disputes was "a principle of American international law". This treaty however was not ratified by the governments whose representatives adopted it. The most lasting achievement of this first Pan-American Conference was the establishment of the Bureau of American Republics in Washington which continues today as the Pan-American Union and which has come to be more and more the clearing house of an increasing number of inter-American activities.

The purpose of this paper precludes a history of Pan-Americanism. Suffice it to say that since 1890 a vast number of congresses and conferences have been held, political, economic, judicial, intellectual; "congresses in which all the American nations have taken part on a basis of equality and reciprocity, to which many have made important contributions, and out of which there has come much discussion, and occasionally some effective action".[9] The effecting of institutions for peace has been a persistent concern: the acceptance of the Hague Convention of 1899, the setting up of pecuniary claims conventions, schemes of compulsory arbitration and of conciliation, the codification of American international law, and even an American league of nations.

These matters have come before the political or diplomatic conferences which have been six in number: Washington in 1889; Mexico City, 1901-02; Rio de Janeiro, 1906; Buenos Aires in 1910; the fifth conference was scheduled to meet in Santiago, Chile, in 1914 but was postponed because of the European War and finally met in 1923; the sixth conference met a year ago in Havana, Cuba.

In addition there have been an International Commission of Jurists, American Financial Conferences, and Pan-American Scientific Congresses. All in all much has been accomplished through the co-operation of the states.

In these post-war years when the United States is striving for some adequate policy and all other nations are equally searching,

[9]Haring, op. cit., p. 48.

Pan-Americanism appears for retesting. And each of the twenty-one republics needs to ask, "Is it the best policy to pursue?" The historian will not find an answer in any scientific judgment which can be handed out *ex cathedra*. At best he can but look for some answer in the current of things in these years of transition.

The Washington Conference of 1889 was not just a passing incident in the course of things. Blaine's appraisal of the commercial interest of the United States fitted in with a process that saw the closing of the American frontier and the transcendence of the industrial order. A decade more and the Yankee Republic had taken its first plunge into imperialism. War with Spain left us in possession of one Caribbean island and with a protectorate over another; the war also gave us the Philippines in Asiatic waters and at the door of China; and Hawaii, with the added value as a stepping stone, was annexed without scruple. There was not a little logic in the war with Spain. Then followed rapidly a new canal treaty with England and, with Theodore Roosevelt in the presidency, the canal itself. Roosevelt said later, "I took Panama," which is perhaps as near the truth as any other formula. Rooseveltian manners have received official disapproval but the balm paid to Colombia was too belated to allay much the aroused fear of the Latin American world.

The Panama Canal gives the bent to our Caribbean policy. Considered as part of our coast line, its protection has become of major concern. This led President Roosevelt to extend the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine—in order to forestall intervention by European creditors of small and irresponsible Caribbean states. The President announced that in flagrant cases of wrongdoing or impotence it might be necessary for the United States to exercise an international police power. Application of the new doctrine was not long in coming. The tangled finances of Santo Domingo, in which several European powers were concerned, resulted in turning it into a virtual protectorate of the United States. Greater or less control in time was extended to all the small states of the Caribbean zone, Costa Rica alone excepted. This warded off danger of coercion from European creditors and safe-guarded the canal but by aggression upon the Latin American world which had not forgotten the unjustifiable conquest of Mexico. Apparently the great republic of the north took what it wanted whenever it suited

its purpose. The smart became the sharper when American financiers profited in the reorganization of finances—"dollar diplomacy".

Accordingly the first decade of the twentieth century saw not an American solidarity. As fear spread throughout the Latin American republics, their Yankee colleague loomed up as the great Colossus of the North and the question persisted, "who next?" The moral base of Pan-Americanism had been seriously undermined.

Such was the situation when Woodrow Wilson came to the presidency. Moreover it was further complicated by the revolution in Mexico which had assumed an ugly phase just at the close of the Taft administration. Huerta had gained the reins of government through the assassination of Madero. Americans were greatly concerned in the situation because of enormous investments. President Taft estimated them at not less than one billion of dollars in 1912. The interests of foreign investors also gave concern to the state department. Could the Wilson government protect life and property in Mexico and at the same time win the confidence of the Latin American states? A truly great task. The limits of this paper do not allow of a survey of Wilson's handling of this problem which is deserving of more careful research than it has yet had. In two respects it bore upon Pan-Americanism. Wilson's refusal to go in and "clean up Mexico" had a salutary effect. In the United States it seemed to mean a weak policy. "Watchful waiting" did not accord with the interests of American investors. Whatever the widsom of the Wilson policy, the refusal to take more of Mexico was a prime essential in the rewinning of Latin American sympathy. The celebration by 10,000 students of Argentina of the shooting up of Pershing's men at Carrizal illustrates how tenuous was the tie that bound the American republics. In this respect Wilson's policy was negative and its importance less readily comprehended but one might, off hours, speculate on what would have been the effect upon Pan-Americanism if, after the seizure of Panama, we had taken another slice of Mexico.

In another respect Wilson's policy had a positive bearing upon Pan-Americanism. When the Vera Cruz episode made war a real possibility, Wilson accepted the mediation offered by the A. B. C.

powers and, although the Niagara conference did not solve the problem in hand, Wilson's willingness to co-operate with the Latin American states in search of a solution of an American problem gave added strength and new meaning to Pan-Americanism. Our minister to Chile, Mr. Fletcher, wrote enthusiastically of "the President's success in the Mexican difficulties—turning, as he did, a situation fraught with difficulties and dangers to our American relations, into a triumph of Pan-Americanism".[10] Dr. Naon, Argentine Ambassador at Washington, remarked in 1913, "There is no Pan-Americanism in South America; it exists only in Washington." But the following year he said: "The Niagara Conference has largely created a real Pan-Americanism; it has made it actual; before this it was merely an ideal."[11]

To Pan-Americanism Wilson gave conscientious and serious attention. Before the Southern Commercial Congress at Mobile, in October, 1913, he spoke of our "relations with our neighbors to the south". The address is noteworthy for its high idealism and for its assurance of security:

> We must prove ourselves their friends, and champions upon terms of equality and honor. You cannot be friends upon any other terms than terms of equality. You cannot be friends at all except upon terms of honor. We must show ourselves friends by comprehending their interest whether it squares with our interest or not. It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in the terms of material interest. It not only is unfair to those with whom you are dealing, but it is degrading as regards your own actions.
>
> Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruits of friendship. . . . I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest.[12]

Rarely have nations built policy upon such high idealism and in view of our past actions it is not surprising that our southern neighbors had not all their fears allayed. Wilson too realized the need of guarantees in more adequate organization. On January 6, 1916, before the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress, he

[10]Charles Seymour, Intimate Papers of Colonel House, I, p. 207.
[11]Blakeslee, op. cit., pp. 134, 135.
[12]R. S. Baker and W. E. Dodd, Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: The New Democracy, I, p. 67.

said that "if America is to come into her own . . . in a world of peace and order, she must establish the foundations of amity, so that no one will hereafter doubt them". In his address he sketched those foundations, a Pan-American Pact:

> It will be accomplished, in the first place, by the states of America uniting in guaranteeing to each other political independence and territorial integrity. In the second place, and as a necessary corollary to that, guaranteeing the agreement to settle all pending boundary disputes as soon as possible and by amicable process; by agreeing that all disputes among themselves, should they unhappily arise, will be handled by patient, impartial investigation and settled by arbitration; and the agreement necessary to the peace of the Americas, that no state of either continent will permit revolutionary expeditions against another state to be fitted out in its territory, and that they will prohibit the exportations of the munitions of war for the purpose of supplying revolutionists against neighboring governments.[13]

A treaty embodying the above proposals was actually drafted but it went further than some of the Latin American states were willing to go and they held back through fear that, though equal in terms, it would in fact give the United States a pretext for the supervising of the affairs of the weak states. The restoration of confidence and faith was not to be achieved in any easy fashion. Wilson's activity in institutionalizing Pan-American amity came to an end as the United States was drawn into the European conflict but the high purposes with which she went to war enlisted the enthusiasm of Latin-Americans and gave to Pan-American sentiment in Latin America its greatest vitality. At the same time the vitality of this sentiment was also rooted in common interest—the preservation of neutral rights was a concern of all, north and south, and there was a strong movement in favor of some joint declaration of the United States and the Latin American republics. Though a joint declaration was not made, President Wilson hoped that the Latin American states would follow our severance of relations with Germany with similar action. When announcing this act to congress he declared his intention of protecting our commerce on the seas, and expressed the hope that all neutral governments would follow a similar course. No doubt the Latin American republics were especially in his mind.

---

[13]Ibid., I, p. 444.

Varying interpretation has been given to Latin America's response to the United States' defense of neutral rights. Professor Blakeslee thinks this brought a "notable response from Latin America."[14] The facts, to the present writer, seem hardly to bear this out. Eight of the twenty Latin American states eventually went to war but of these all but one belonged to the Caribbean zone and of them four were virtually protectorates of the United States. Brazil was the only great state that declared war. Five states, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Santo Domingo and Uruguay severed relations. Of the states that declared war, only Cuba and Brazil took any part in it. On the other hand, though Argentina did not go to war, popular sentiment was in favor of it. Only the action of her executive prevented her taking sides with the allies. Señor Naon, Argentina's ambassador to the United States staked his diplomatic career on the issue. He said "divergence between" the United States and Argentina "is incompatible with this Pan-American idea. . . . Whatever danger, directly or indirectly, may threaten the one, must be a danger to the other. . . . Hence it is impossible for me to conceive, without being uneasy for the fate of my country, the slightest political misunderstanding between these nations at a time when they are confronted by so grave a crisis."[15]

The years 1914 to 1919 marked the height of Pan-American sentiment in Latin America and, though it was in part rooted in interest, it was in no small measure due to the idealism with which the United States went to war and in particular to Mr. Wilson's advocacy of the League of Nations. The Latin American is temperamentally sensitive to idealism and the brotherhood, universality and respect for small nations written into the League readily enlisted his support of it. Moreover a state from the New World had put it into the treaty.

With the end of the war came a universal moral slump and the United States failed to adopt the program for the peace of the

[14]Op. cit., p. 137.

[15]Ibid., pp. 139-140. The government of Uruguay took an advanced Pan-American position: "The Government of Uruguay has proclaimed the principle of American solidarity as the criterion of its policy, understanding that the grievance against the rights of one country of the continent would be considered as a grievance by all." Ibid., p. 138.

world which their idealism had promised. This was a keen disappointment for the Latin American. Had he after all misplaced his faith? In any case old suspicions came creeping back and again he gave attention to the policy of the United States in the Caribbean.

Like the rest of the world Latin America was left with many and serious problems of readjustment; problems, political, social, economic and psychological. Their impingement upon Pan-Americanism is our concern. The world wide collapse of prices in 1920 and 1921 affected the Latin-American greatly and severely. He found his warehouses filling up with goods from the United States whose values were dropping below the prices which the importer had undertaken to pay for them. True he was technically obligated but he felt that the North American exporter had displayed undue haste in shipping at once all standing orders. Moreover, a sharp decline in exchange to the disadvantage of the Latin American made payments still more difficult and the idea gained credence that American financiers had manipulated the exchange. Naturally there followed distress, discontent and ill-will. More fundamental and more lasting were the general economic changes that war and reconstruction brought about.

In this revolution the United States came to occupy a startlingly prominent place. Her trade increased enormously as did her capital investments. Total trade with Latin American increased some 250 per cent between 1914 and 1926. South of Panama the gain was 300 per cent. Our exports to Latin America in 1926 amounted to $847,000,000 and our imports from there, $1,012,000,000. Our industrial investments have not so greatly increased but public securities of South America have absorbed great amounts of American capital. In 1912 the total investments of the United States in South America were estimated at about 170 million dollars. In 1924 they had increased to 1,229 millions. The increase in public securities was from less than 15 millions to over 600 millions. These figures are not only significant in their amounts but in their relation to the decline of European trade and investments. Turning to the whole region south of the Rio Grande, American investments at the end of 1927 amounted to $5,260,000,000 whereas European investments amounted to but 2 billions more. The vast economic power of the United States

would seem to be engulfing Latin America. To escape labor costs in the United States our plants are moving into the southern continent. The Chevrolet plant at São Paulo turned out 2000 cars a month last winter. Brazil is not without profit but as never before the North American looms larger and larger on the scene. An all American cable system is now set up and steamship lines connect directly with New York. The entry of the Associated Press and the United Press has changed the news for both the Latin and the English American. With an eye to economics, one Mexican critic likens the Pan-American Union, in its marble palace in Washington, to the British Colonial Office, extending our financial and commercial grip on Latin America.[16]

The fact is that Latin America is debtor to the United States to an enormous amount. Debtor psychology, our own frontier history has amply exhibited. In inter-American relations it has become exaggerated because of race and temperament and disparity in size and political power. Easily, then, may Pan-Americanism appear as synonymous with Yankee imperialism.

It is entirely natural that this sudden and tremendous change in the economic relationships of the two America's should produce discontent manifested in a hostility toward the United States. And naturally it militates against American solidarity. What is less understood is the surge of life that courses through the Latin continent. It took Latin America a long time to rid itself of three centuries of unenlightened colonialism but, as history goes, the process has been about as speedy as one could expect. South America is growing rapidly, growing in numbers, in wealth, in political stability, and in culture. One can today be knocked down as easily in Buenos Aires with a taxi cab as he can in New York City. Latin America today is repeating the experiences of the United States during the "roaring 40's." That was the generation in which Manifest Destiny guided us across the continent. It was a strenuous generation when, detached from Europe and filled with self-confidence and bombast, we aspired to rule from pole to pole. Debtor to Europe, it was true, and colonial in our culture, but buoyant and confident of the future. Thus Latin America, and withal self-conscious and sensitive.

[16] *Independent*, August 7, 1926, pp. 149, 150.

Latin America is coming to maturity but the United States is not yet aware of the fact. She says she no longer needs a "papa" and, as the implied tutelage of President Monroe's day is no longer needed, asks why we persist in holding an umbrella over her after the rain has stopped. Pan-Americanism she views as a policy of the United States for the United States. In its place she is proposing Latin American solidarity. The emphasis varies with different individuals. It may be cultural or economic or political or all. Again, there are the Pan-Hispanists who would seek some affiliation with Madrid, sentimental or political. The Pan-Latinists find in Paris their intellectual seat. What is the strength of these various tendencies, it is impossible to say. An active student movement throughout the Latin American world is loud in condemnation of Pan-Americanism and advocates some continental organization. To date this movement has received little or no official cognizance. It is nevertheless a noticeable feature in Latin American life and, as one talks with those who come into our American universities, he feels the strength of their enthusiasm and idealism.

Hatred of the United States permeates their feeling as it does the literary figures of Latin America. One of the best known novelists of Colombia entitles one of his books, "The Yankee—Behold the Enemy." In it he says:

> The Yankees are giving themselves to the plunder of Latin America. The Yankees are a lustful race, hostile and contemptuous, spurious and cruel, insolent toward us, with a monstrous idea of their superiority, and desire for conquest. . . . What happened in Cuba was but the prologue of a drama—the conquest of America. . . . Hate for the Yankee should be our motto.[17]

It was Manuel Ugarte who led the Argentine students in a demonstration of joy when Pershing's men were shot at Carrizal. It may be asked whether any action or policy on the part of the United States would very greatly have modified the trend of feeling in the Latin American republics. A large part of the present situation is the inevitable result of the working of economic and psychological forces in a field which presents such disparities and contrasts as are to be found in the twenty-one republics of the

[17]Ibid., p. 148.

Western World. The situation is in large measure inherent in the processes of growth.

Nevertheless the policy of the United States is a determining factor. Failure to join the League of Nations, insistence on the Monroe Doctrine and refusal to Pan-Americanize it and the assertion of the right of intervention as the judgment of the government may dictate have done much to alienate Latin American sentiment.

Not only was South America disillusioned when the United States failed to go into the League, but today the League seems to offer an opportunity for the Latin American states to play a part on a world stage and find protection against the North American menace. Their position has been not a little flattering. Four of the ten Assemblies have elected Latin Americans as their presidents. In September of this year Gustavo Guerrero of Salvador was made president of the tenth Assembly. Three times has the League Council been presided over by Latin Americans, and, in the Ninth Assembly, Cuba was elected a member of the Council, and Latin America has also contributed judges to the Court of International Justice. And yet Mr. Hoover, bespeaking his interest in all instruments of peace in his Armistice Day speech of a few days back, said that Europe has its League of Nations, but that that way we have refused to travel. He may have been preparing the way for the ratification of the Pan-American arbitration treaty which comes to the senate this winter, but the fact that most of the American Republics, as well as Canada, are members of the League impairs the observations of Mr. Hoover.

One reason the United States did not join the League was fear that the Monroe Doctrine would be jeopardized. Upon insistence from the United States, Mr. Wilson put Article XXI into the Covenant reserving "regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine." What was a regional understanding? And could the Monroe Doctrine be such, and yet be unilateral as we have always contended? The Senate was wary and played safe. Our insistence upon the Monroe Doctrine is today one of the major grievances of the Latin American world. Why our insistence upon it, asks Latin America; there is no longer danger of conquest by Europe and the European system of Monroe's day is gone forever. But our insistence upon it is an outstanding fact of recent years. When the Permanent Court of International Justice was before the

Senate, that body attached reservations safeguarding in fact the Monroe Doctrine. Though the Senate ratified the Paris Pact without reservations, its Committee on Foreign Affairs set forth an "understanding" reserving to the United States "the right to maintain the Monroe Doctrine, which is a part of our national defense."

The Monroe Doctrine today occupies a curious place in American psychology, a touchstone of patriotism, almost a fetish, and with the Senate, so much of an obsession as to obscure the realities of the post-war world. When the doctrine was announced by President Monroe in 1823, the United States was a young nation still carrying vestiges of its colonialism and Latin America was just entering a stage of violent post-revolutionary adjustment. The Monroe Doctrine squared with the realities of the day. But that day is past. The United States is now the most powerful nation of the world and much of Latin America consists of great and stable states to whom an asserted tuletage seems an insult if not more threatening. These are new realities and new realities require new policies.

Moreover there is a wide spread belief among the Latin democracies that the Monroe Doctrine is being used today as a cloak for the justification of policies which have no relation to the defense of the United States or Latin America against European aggression and that it is being invoked to further the interests of the United States at the expense of her sister Republics—to promote dollar diplomacy, economic imperialism, the reservation of certain parts of Latin America as exclusive preserves for the commercial exploitation of North Americans and the right of our intervention in their domestic affairs.

With the old dangers past and a new set of realities confronting us, the question may fairly be asked, as Professor Garner does ask it, whether the "continued assertion" of the Monroe Doctrine "is really 'worth the candle.' "[18] If one is fearful of altruism in foreign policy he may still ask if selfish interest may not profit by abandoning insistence upon a policy whose premises are gone.

Or if the Doctrine is still of value for the Western World, would it not be to the interest of Pan-Americanism to make of it a Pan-

[18]W. F. Garner, American Foreign Policies, p. 130.

American doctrine, to make it multilateral instead of unilateral. There is a suggestion of this in President Wilson's address before the Second Pan-American Scientific Conference, quoted above, when he said that Pan-American friendship "will be accomplished, in the first place, by the states of America uniting in guaranteeing to each other absolute political independence and territorial integrity."

At the fifth Pan-American Conference held at Santiago, Chile, in 1923 efforts to give a collective character to the Doctrine and to convert it into an international formula were blocked when the Chairman of the United States delegation declared that the Monroe Doctrine was aunilateral policy of the United States, to be interpreted and enforced by our country alone. The consequences of our stand were most unfortunate for Pan-Americanism. Much favorable comment has been made concerning the Conference and good is no doubt to be recorded, but it would seem to have been more than offset by resentment engendered by our attitude and by the impetus given to the movement for Latin American solidarity. Thus are being dissipated the gains of the Wilson period.

A notable achievement of the Santiago Conference was a peace treaty, signed by sixteen of the American republics, providing that all controversies between American states which fail of diplomatic solution shall be submitted to an American commission of inquiry for investigation and report, and that during the period of investigation there shall be no military mobilization. At the Sixth Pan-American Conference held at Havana, Cuba, in 1928, action was taken which led to the drafting in Washington a year later of still more adequate instruments of peace—treaties of conciliation and arbitration. The former was ratified by the United States in February, 1929; the latter will no doubt go before the Senate in its forth-coming session.

If the spirit of these treaties can be written into our psychologies as well as into our law we will have amply fulfilled one of the major ideals of Mr. Blaine as he planned for the First Pan-American Conference, and yet Pan-Americanism as a spiritual solidarity is less and less a reality today. The last of the Pan-American Conferences gives little comfort to the Pan-Americanists.[19]

[19]In the account of the Sixth Pan-American Conference, the writer is greatly indebted to Foreign Policy Association, Information Service, IV, No. 4 (April 27, 1928) for its clear presentation of facts.

The Sixth International Conference of American States met at Havana from January 16 to February 20. The occasion was none too opportune with the "intervention" of the United States in Nicaragua hovering in the background. President Coolidge's decision to attend may have been a stroke to ward off attacks against our intervention, but his unimaginative use of the battleship *Texas* did not add grace to the occasion.

The efforts at Havana to give political powers to the Union and the failure to do so, are among the most important consequences of the Conference. Uruguay and Costa Rica suggested at Santiago in 1923 an American League of Nations, but without results. At Havana efforts were revived to give political power to the Union. A major proposal was to give to the Governing Board of the Union authority to conciliate disputes between American states. The proposal was pressed from various angles and had considerable support. Mexico and Salvador opposed the strengthening of the powers of the Union fearing that it would but give greater power to the United States. But Mr. Varela, of Uruguay, wanted it possible to use the Union for conciliation when it should be desired. Similarly Brazil, whose representative said "the evolution of international relations is in the direction of a general discipline over collective interests, establishing an organization in which the liberty of each is limited by the rights of others. . . ." But the movement to give this power to the Union was voted down twelve to six. The United States voted "No." Then Mexico's proposal that the Governing Board of the Union should exercise no political functions was adopted.

An effort to bring important economic questions within the purview of the Union was also made, but without avail. Mr. Pueyrreòdn, of Argentina, insisted that the preamble to the constitution of the Pan-American Union embody a declaration in regard to a reduction of economic barriers. This opened a way for the voicing of views of those American states whose interests were injured by the tariff policy of the United States. Blaine had said that Pan-Americanism was the application of Christian principles to international business. President Wilson in his Fourteen Points contended that the removal of trade barriers was essential to world peace. But neither Blaine nor Wilson were at Havana and the less imaginative Mr. Hughes duly opposed any Pan-American con-

sideration of inter-American trade. He said, "Let us continue our cultural work, our co-operation in those lines where we feel we have a community of interest."

Another important problem brought before the Havana Conference was the right of intervention. This led to much debate but to no solution. Three different views as to intervention were voiced at Havana: (1) The non-intervention view which holds that all states are equal and independent, and that a great state has no right forcibly to impose its will upon a small state. This was held by most of the Latin American governments. (2) The view of national intervention, held by the United States, which contends that when governments break down and American property and lives are threatened, the United States government has the right to intervene. (3) The view of internal intervention, which admits that intervention may at times be necessary but that it should be carried out only by joint decisions and actions.

A Commission of American Jurists assembled at Rio de Janiero in 1927 adopted the phrase, "*Ninguno Estado puede intervenir en los asuntos internos de otro.*" It is understood that the United States delegates accepted this proposal believing that the term *internos* should be interpreted to mean "domestic." The Pan-American Union translated the formula to read, "No state may interfere in the internal affairs of another," and in that form it went before the Havana Conference.

Debate on the resolution revealed the adherence by the great number of American states to the principle of non-intervention and, while Mr. Hughes might have avoided debate by a restricted definition of "internal", he chose not to, openly defending our government's claim to the right to intervene in those states where failure of government might jeopardize American property and life.

This debate was one of the most significant episodes of the Conference. Feeling ran high before it was over and speeches required editing to delete indelicacies! The United States stood almost alone in opposition to what Mr. Guerrero declared were the "almost unanimous aspirations" of the American states. At the same time the open defense of our intervention policy may simplify the problem by the very frankness of our stand, but for the time being it plays into the hands of those pressing for Latin American

solidarity and seems, to the present writer, to reveal a fundamental incompatibility. Mr. Hughes speech was also important because of its declaration that our government has no permanent designs upon Latin America. Mr. Hughes said: "There are no desires or ambitions which my country entertains which are opposed to the desires and aspirations of our sister Republics. . . . We yield to none in the establishment of the ideal of sovereignty and independence for every one of the American Republics from the greatest to the smallest. . . . We do not wish the territory of any American Republic." Nevertheless the United States claims in full the right of intervention—"interposition of a temporary character," Mr. Hughes called it—and when and in what manner only the United States might decide.

Mention has already been made of the problems of conciliation and arbitration.

But, surveying the Havana Conference as a whole, one is not hopeful of Pan-Americanism. In a generation which has every reason to distrust the older nationalism and when the realities of politics point to some collective discipline, the Havana Conference rejected any proposal granting to Pan-Americanism political vitality.

"If a customs' union for the Americas were established, if the Pan-American Union were converted into a political organization empowered to conciliate various American disputes and to supervise policing the troublesome area in the Caribbean and Central America, Pan-Americanism might become a reality." But it was just these things that were denied at Havana.

Many factors are operating against Pan-Americanism today. (1) Disparity among the American Republics. The great size, wealth and power of the United States has not permitted it to act as one of the equals among the American States. There is also great variation among the Latin American States themselves, variations in size, wealth, stages of political order and language. (2) The coming to maturity of a large part of Latin America and its consciousness of strength and sensitiveness to slight. (3) The dominant nationalism of the United States as of some of the other American States. (4) The assumed tutelag of thee United States over the other Republics, plus its continued assertion of the Monroe Doctrine and of a right to intervene, have lead not to friendship

but to hatred. (5) The tendencies toward Latin American solidarity.

These are factors operating within the American states. (6) In a broader view the premises of Pan-Americanism have lost validity. This policy arose out of the belief that the American Republics had a set of interests distinct from the interests of the rest of the world: geographic propinquity, a distinctive and superior political order—republicanism, fear of Europe and isolation from her. To adapt the words of Washington, "Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation?" To-day there is nothing "peculiar" left. Not one of the distinctive interests remains to-day nor does there remain that "common patriotism" of which Maia wrote to Jefferson. (7) As the premises of Pan-Americanism have lost significance, new realities have asserted themselves—an international economic order and an emerging world society. Said Woodrow Wilson, "We are in the great drift of humanity." If this is true, hemispherical isolation is an anachronism.

The limitations of Pan-Americanism asserted themselves at Havana in the consideration of certain economic matters—aviation, trademarks, radio, immigration and Chamber of Commerce. These were practical matters which had ramifications that involved more than the Americas and in which no merely American solution could be adequate. In another field the uniqueness of Pan-Americanism was minimized at Havana. In the efforts to codify American International Law, the Commission of American Jurists at Rio declined to accept the term "American International Law" as inappropriate. When the subject came up at Havana Mr. Guerrero pointed out that the term admitted something which he did not believe existed, "peculiarities which give to American peoples greater rights or duties of another nature than those which all the States of the world enjoy."

Thus does Pan-Americanism find itself in conflict with Internationalism. The post-war drift of Pan-Americanism is away from the realization of its ideal in which the pressure of new realities seems destined to relegate to the discard the projected solidarity of the American Republics.

IRVING STODDARD KULL

GERMAN VERSUS POLISH NATIONALISM: A QUESTION OF TREATY REVISION

To estimate the real place established by the Treaty of Versailles or the potentialities for peace in the contemporary world as a result of that settlement, one must visit the "sore spots" of Europe. Especially is such a visit an illuminating experience for Americans for several reasons. In the first place, we are far removed geographically from those actual scenes where the territorial divisions of the peace treaty are functioning; we are insulated from the carking discontent, the political and economic instability in those areas by placid, self-satisfied American contentment, by far-famed American prosperity and security. And ,finally, we Americans are lulled into a confident and pleasurable sense of world peace by such concrete and tangible symbols of international good-will as the Locarno Treaties, the Kellogg Pact, the membership of an eminent American jurist in the World Court, the speeches of an equally eminent American university professor at international conferences, such as the recent Institute of Pacific Relations, and, finally, by the charming and reassuring picture of Ramsay MacDonald and Herbert Hoover balancing, so to speak, the two greatest sea powers upon a log across the rushing Rapidan River in the Virginia hills and planning to disarm the world.

These are the items that occupy the head lines in our daily press. The everyday clashes between Poles and Germans over markets and post boxes, over dykes and passports and all the details of daily living, which constitute, nevertheless, the warp and woof of history, are not so vividly reported.

The general impression prevails therefore—and it is not surprising—that at the beginning of this second decade since the close of the World War, the "lamb has lain down with the lion" and all is well. In contemplating this happy spectacle, we need to recollect, however, that the Locarno Treaties applied to the western frontiers and not to the eastern; that while all may be "Quiet on the Western Front", the same cannot be said of the eastern front. Indeed, the very fact that Germany, because of

the Locarno Treaties, has accepted the western frontier as a *fait accompli*, enables her to focus her attention upon the problems and, to her mind, the wrongs and injustices of the settlement in the east, and so to concentrate all her efforts upon treaty revision in that area.

Hence it is the purpose of this paper to draw your attention to a portion of the eastern frontier, to Danzig and the Polish Corridor in order to indicate the working of the new arrangements after a ten years trial.

First, to reconstruct the scene of our exploration. It will be recalled that the map-drawers at Versailles in reconstituting the national state of Poland gave to that country a strip of territory stretching from the northern boundary of Upper Silesia northward to the Baltic Coast, about two hundred sixty miles in length with an average breadth of eighty miles, together with a sea border along the Baltic Sea of about ninety miles, which to everyone, except the Poles, is known as the Polish Corridor. Also, in order to give to the newly constituted republic an outlet to the sea and hence to the currents of world trade, these same map-drawers detached the city of Danzig, with about seven hundred square miles of hinterland, from Germany and erected it into a Free State under the League of Nations in which Poland possesses some very well-defined privileges.

Now, with all the racial, historical, political, economic and diplomatic reasons which guided the map-drawers we are not, at present, concerned; but rather with the empirical results of their decisions as represented today by the frictions, antagonisms, discontents and nationalistic strife in that area. How have the arrangements worked? Why is not, "all quiet on the eastern front"? Why are the Germans vociferously demanding treaty revision and the Poles industriously preventing it? These are some of the questions which this discussion hopes to answer.

To a visitor in the district it is at once obvious that the nationalistic friction between German and Pole resolves itself around three issues which may be conveniently listed as: the ports, the Vistula River, and East Prussia. But just as nothing within the area itself, be it dykes, or post-boxes or railroads, may be divided without immediate trouble arising, so we shall have to remember

that we will not be able to keep these three issues separate, even for purposes of analysis; they are all three inextricably interrelated.

The Ports

Beginning with the ports, for, as a contemporary writer has recently remarked, "more history is made in ports than this world imagines". The port or Free State of Danzig first engages our attention. An old Hansa town founded by Germans about 1224, but under Polish suzerainty for more than three centuries (1454-1793). it combines in an astonishing manner the romance of history and of commerce. As the visitor strolls through its narrow streets, or along the quays and wharves, he is surrounded on all sides with the marks of its medieval grandeur or the symbols of its commercial greatness: the palaces of its merchant princes with their high stone stoops, an indication of aristocratic, bourgeois exclusiveness; the old-time markets; the *Englisches Haus* with its ornate facade, the headquarters of the English merchants of the sixteenth century; the ancient gothic *Rathaus* with its richly panelled and decorated interior, redolent of medieval bourgeois wealth; and the great gothic church of St. Mary where are stored the flags and uniforms of the Teutonic Knights. At times he seems to breathe the very atmosphere of the Middle Ages.

And if the Middle Age was characterized by the clash of many individual sovereignties eternally conflicting, as historians assure us, the visitor to Danzig literally does breathe a medieval atmosphere. For today, Danzig is under no less than five separate governments: its own Senate, holding authority from the local constitution of the Free City; the Polish government which controls its foreign affairs, its transit and its customs according to the Danzig-Polish Convention negotiated by the Allied Powers in 1920 and expanded by the Supplementary Treaty of 1921; the Harbor Board which operates the Port, consisting of one-half Polish and one-half German members, with a foreign, neutral chairman, set up by the Supplementary Polish-Danzig Treaty of 1921; a High Commissioner appointed by the League of Nations under the Constitution imposed by the Versailles Treaty; and, finally, the Council of the League which hears appeals, functioning under the League Covenant. Abundant opportunity here, you

will observe, for friction, for the clash of German and Polish nationalism. What are the principal difficulties?

In 1918, when the Free State was erected, the population was reckoned at

Germans..... 308,000
Poles..... 16,000.[1]

The Poles immediately initiated a policy of Polonization, having undergone a thorough instruction in its methods as victims of the pre-war Germanization of Prussian Poland. They started Polish banks, business houses, and introduced Polish clerks and officials. But this policy did not succeed as the elections to the *Volkstag* incontestably demonstrate. The German vote rose while the Polish vote declined. In the city of Danzig itself, the German vote increased by nearly six thousand in 1923 and the Polish decreased by nearly thirteen hundred. Thus it is evident that Danzig is and will remain a German city with the strongest national and patriotic feeling.

Hence the racial and psychological antagonism in the Free State is acute. The Poles contend that, because of the preponderance of German population and hence German culture and nationalism in this port which was designed by the peacemakers as their outlet to the sea, Danzig is really, today, part of the German *Reich*; that even its local political parties are but branches of the great German parties; and that, what is more, the Germans are using it as a base of propaganda for treaty revision. The first two contentions are correct and no doubt there is much truth in the third. Certainly a visit to the City Archives revealed the fact that the city Fathers had exploited their opportunity there at hand to advertise Germany's continuous domination of the city, even when under Polish suzerainty, by a complete and most interesting special exhibit of the documents and treaties of the Hanseatic League. Moreover, the exhibit was written up in a large pamphlet in English entitled *Danzig's German Character and National Independence and its Importance in the Past*, and distributed gratis. Also a personal call, voluntary and unsolicited, from the woman leader of the Nationalist Party, who expatiated

[1] *Foreign Policy Assoc. Information Bulletin, Aug., 1927*

at length upon the burdens and wrongs of the *Danzigers*, confirmed, at least, the feminine political interest in propaganda.

It will be seen from the Constitution that it is the duty of the High Commissioner, appointed by the League of Nations, to arbitrate the differences between Danzigers and Poles. Three of these have been Englishmen, one an Italian and one a Dutchman. From the nature of the case there have, of course ,been innumerable wrangles. Between the years 1921-1926 no less than forty-nine decisions were handed down. Of these, three may be mentioned as illustrating the continual Polish-German strife for political power in Danzig: the quarrel over the railways which ended in dividing the ownership of the standard-gauge railways between Poland and the Harbor Board, and giving the narrow-gauge lines and tram-lines to Danzig; the bitter controversy over the control of the post, really almost a civil war enduring for a year and resulting in a victory for the Danzigers; and, finally, the conflict over the establishment of a Polish munitions base within the Harbor of Danzig in the area known as the *Westerplatte*, which terminated in a victory for the Poles. The latter is the most significant for it gives the Poles a piece of actual Poland within the Danzig harbor and, because of its explosive nature, constitutes both a literal and a figurative menace to German political strength and position in Danzig. The fact that this Polish munitions dump is situated upon made land, formerly devoted to a bathing and recreation resort for the Danzigers, but increases its constant irritation of German nationalism.

But it is probably in the economic sphere that the functioning of the peace settlements provides the greatest opportunity for the most modern expression of nationalistic conflict.

Before the war Danzig was surrounded by German territory, a larger hinterland, indeed, than Poland now possesses, which provided her with both a rich agricultural market for German goods and a supply of cattle, horses and agrarian products which found, in turn, a ready sale in Germany. She was the metropolis of this rich, agricultural land whither the lower reaches of the Vistula and the excellent Prussian water systems carried a large volume of water-borne traffic. More than that she was, under Germany, a ship-building centre and she possessed to the east a ready market in pre-war Russia. Suddenly uprooted by the

peace settlement from her commercial, financial and industrial ties with Berlin and the Fatherland, she has had to adjust herself to a customs union controlled from Warsaw. Her former close German and Russian markets are now the new Polish Republic. Thus, her markets have been dislocated, or lost, her trade connections cut, her own agriculture injured by the cheaper products from Poland. Add to this the minor difficulties of the two currencies: the Danzig gulden on a gold basis and the Polish zloty, not so stable, which is also legal tenure and compulsory for fares on trains with destinations in Poland.

But worst of all for the difficult readjustment of Danzig trade is the tariff war between Poland and Germany which has been waged since 1925. Poland places prohibitory duties on Danzig's products, such as the once world-famed liquer, Danzig Gold Water, sugar, sweets, chocolate, matches, tobacco, and upon the so-called "contingents" of German goods which Danzig had the right to import duty free; while Germany stops Poland's importation of coal from Upper Silesia, zinc, naphtha, sulphuric acid. Again and again, negotiations for a German-Polish commercial treaty have been begun but they never reach a conclusion. Just recently, there seems to be more hope, as the official personnel of both German and Polish negotiators is growing more conciliatory.

To add to the Danziger's complaints in regard to the falling off of their trade and consequent decline in their prosperity, the Poles retort that, economically, Danzig is more prosperous than it could be under any other règime except complete absorption into Poland; that her trade under Poland is much greater than it was before under Germany. To prove this, they point to the tell-tale figures which show an increase in the Port's turnover of

2,370,000 tons imports and exports in 1924
5,300,000 tons imports and exports in 1926
8,500,000 tons imports and exports in 1928.[2]

whereas in 1913, the year before the war, her imports and exports under Germany reached barely two million tons. In fact, the Poles claim that Danzig's trade actually declined under Germany since the empire aggrandised Stettin and Königsberg at Danzig's

[2]Berliner.

expense; while, now under Poland, Danzig is next to Stockholm and Copenhagen, the largest port on the Baltic.

Polish timber, coal and oil have, they assert, effected this transformation. To which the Danzigers reply that this trade increase has been due to a temporary stimulation provided by the coal strike in England which threw the Scandanavian coal market into Poland's hands; and that, in any case, these traffic figures are misleading in that most of them refer to transit trade controlled by Poles. It does not help local Danzig business and industry which is hard hit, anyway, by competition from Poland with its depreciated currency, as compared with Danzig, and its cheaper labor.

Finally, if any additional evidence is required to prove our point that economic peace and good will do not prevail at Danzig, the existence of the new port on the Corridor which the Poles have recently gone off by themselves and built will provide it. This is called Gdynia and is located just twelve miles west of Danzig on the Baltic Sea. Like a mushroom it has grown up in the night. Indeed it is called the "miracle of Gdynia", for eight years ago it was a tiny fishing village of three hundred inhabitants, a collection of fisher huts scattered along the shore of the Baltic Sea; today it is a port of over twenty-five thousand inhabitants with a visiting population daily of six thousand workmen from the neighborhood. Although not situated, like most ports, at the mouth of a river, it possesses other natural advantages: it lies inside the Hela peninsula, protected from the sea itself; is ice-free and has both an inner and an outer harbor. But, above everything else, it is located within the Corridor and is therefore wholly Polish, a living expression of Polish nationalism, of Polish economic ambition.

When one first approaches Gdynia, one is not certain whether it is a mining camp, a wilderness, a city, or all three. Here is a broad fine street; there, a network of ditches that will someday be streets. Next the humble fisher hut rises a modern six-storied building growing up apparently out of a potato-patch. Beautiful villas stand alongside long, ugly laborers' barracks. A giant modern post office, the complex structures of a navy school, banks, churches and hospitals form the nucleus of a public-building

section of the city; while two-storied, sea-side cottages, a pleasure garden and a flag-strung recreation pier bravely flaunt the beginning of a bathing-resort quarter. No city on our western prairies ever sprang into being with such rapidity nor with such an ambitious plan. On every side excavating, building, grading have their ceaseless round.

A net-work of rails leads past a siding railway station to the harbour, not yet completed but already in use. Here, again, one encounters activity of every kind: quays in all states of construction, rattling cranes, creaking derricks, modern elevators, the lading and unlading of ships. Two enormous landing stages are ready, a third is under construction. A refrigeration plant of fifteen thousand tons capacity, one of the largest in Europe, will be completed this year. Two private warehouses are finished, a third is building. An immense rice mill and warehouse have been erected in the modern style and painted a gorgeous Polish red and white; while up-to-date coal apparatus has been installed by the Upper Silesian coal firms for their own use. When this section of the harbor is completed in 1930, it will contain an area of five hundred acres, seven thousand miles of quays, and a number of inter-communicating basins around which industrial plants are to be grouped. Next year will see the beginning of the second section which is planned to more than double the harbor's capacity. Beyond, there is the outer basin where are certain old torpedo and gun boats, the beginnings of a Polish naval base. The ministry of war has begun its building, next to it stands the Polish-French Consortium in which Schneider and Creuzot has a share.

As one goes about the harbor in a pilot boat, one senses an orderly commercial routine in the midst of the disordered construction. All is activity. In 1923, the first foreign ship entered the harbour, today, although most of the shipping is transient, there are already four shipping lines: the American-Scantic Line with weekly service; the French line with monthly service to Riga and Leningrad, and every ten days to Havre; another French line, which next year will be under the Polish flag, to South America; and a Polish-British line of four ships running regularly to Hull and London. The tonnage passing through the port has risen from ninety thousand in 1924 to eight hundred ninety-six thousand

in 1927 and almost three million is expected in 1929. The second section of the harbor, when completed is planned to give a handling capacity of fifteen million tons a year. Today, coal constitutes eighty-seven per cent of the total turnover of the port. Other exports, such as furniture to South America, polished rice to England, meal products for cattle to Königsberg, cement and sugar make up three per cent of the total; while imports into Poland supply the remaining ten per cent. These are raw rice from Rangoon, fertilisers from Belgium, iron ore, smelted iron and paving stone from Sweden.[2]

Of course, this "miracle city" has not been achieved without enormous effort and enormous expenditure provided by foreign money. The obstacles have been as tremendous as the results are impressive. Gdynia is not on a river but also it is not even on a railroad. At present, Poland is building a direct line through the Corridor from Bromberg to Gdynia. It will scale the high Cashubian plateau, avoid the necessity of passage over the East Prussian railways and will shorten the distance from Gdynia to Kattowitz five hundred forty-two kilometers. Apparently the Poles stop at nothing. In the recent words of an Englishman on the subject, "Gdynia is magnificent: it is a courageous expression of Polish nationalism: it is a demonstration of economic independence: it is a tribute to the ambition of the new state." It is by far the most amazing, the most portentous thing in the Baltic: amazing as signifying the growth of Poland; portentous because of Danzig and the Corridor.

That it is a courageous expression of Polish nationalism at any rate, is all too evident as the reaction to it of outraged German nationalism proves. At first, the Germans ignored Gdynia. The attitude of the Danzigers towards it was that of the proverbial ostrich with his head in the sand. But as the Poles continued steadily to reclaim the Baltic sands for Gdynia, the Danziger ostrich had no place in which to hide, and must needs regard the "miracle city", although he calls it Gydingen, not Gdynia. Regarding it, Germans of course condemn it and on the following grounds. It is a dangerous rival to Danzig, they claim, designed to suck the economic life out of Danzig, that economic life so sorely

[3]*Berliner Tageblatt, Oct. 22, 1929*

restricted already; and the port figures are cited to bear out the German contention. For the expected tonnage of Gdynia in 1929 (3,000,000 tons) exceeds that of Danzig in 1913 by nearly nine hundred thousand; while the number of ships arriving in Danzig during the first nine months of 1929 is thirteen hundred less than arrived in 1928. Moreover, Germany claims, Gdynia is a dangerous competitor because the Poles have made the port dues lower than Danzig's; vessels are allowed to coal free there; warehouse rates are trifling; imports are encouraged by low rates and exports stimulated by all kinds of subsidies, such as cheap transport. Again, the Germans resent Gdynia inasmuch as it was represented at the Peace Conference that Danzig was the natural and only outlet for Poland, Poland received her rights there for that reason and now she has created a second port for herself on the Baltic. But, above everything else, German nationalism fears Gdynia as the Polish nationalist guarantee of the eastern boundary. Germany envisions Gdynia developing into a world port and the Polish eagle taking possession of the Corridor. To this great fear is subordinated the secondary fear of Gdynia as a Polish war base, a sword, or rather a whole arsenal, so to speak, between Danzig and the Fatherland.

Poland rebuts all of these German complaints about her "miracle city" by claiming that she has been obliged to build Gdynia because Danzig is too far down the river and is too small for her outlet and her trade; that, therefore, Gdynia is no competitor but merely a supplement. She points to her total twenty-five million tons turn-over in goods for 1928, forty per cent of which was by sea, thirty-three per cent of which in turn, was handled by Danzig which amounted to three-fourths of her total turn-over in 1913. But Poland envisages a future *sea* turn-over of goods amounting to twenty-five million tons in which case, she claims, she requires an additional port. No less a person than Mr. Charles Dewey, the American financial advisor to Poland, supports Poland in this contention. In his last report he stated that Danzig is incapable of sufficient development to meet the increased Polish traffic because of her natural surroundings which do not admit of largely increased quayage. This, of course, the Germans deny and so the age-old impact of German upon Pole and the interminable nationalistic quarrel continues.

But we have lingered too long in the ports. Let us step back into the Polish Corridor and examine the second issue.

The Vistula River

Now corridors are notoriously drafty places and windy rumors of all kinds of nationalistic strifes and quarrels blow unrestrainedly across and up and down the Polish Corridor. Time will not permit the description of all of them but only of the most serious of those well established by fact, hence the selection of the Vistula River as the chief issue.

Again, a reference to the geographic scene. The two hundred sixty miles of Corridor, with an average width of eighty miles, was carved out of the German provinces of West Prussia and Posen, including the Vistula River which runs now close along its eastern border, forming as it approaches Danzig part of the boundary. In pre-war days this entire section had been made an integral part of the German Empire, economically, in which the Vistula River played a very important rôle. For, under Germany, what is now the southern part of the Corridor had been industrialized and the northern part, consisting of the richly fertile alluvial plain of the river, developed agriculturally to its utmost capacity: in the south, industrial undertakings included woodwork, and sugar factories, flour mills, metal and leather works; while in the north, the large agricultural estates produced pigs, potatoes and pedigreed stock in immense quantities. To facilitate transportation for this active industrial and agricultural life, the Germans had applied their usual efficiency to the utilization of the waterways, the chief of which was the Vistula. They expended immense sums and much engineering skill, not only in making the Vistula navigable for ninety-five miles from its mouth, but in building dykes and canals to prevent floods and silting, in maintaining a fleet of dredges, flood-measuring posts and buoys, in canalisation and in embankments; but, also, in connecting it with other rivers, such as the Oder, the Elbe, the Warthe, the Niemen, and with a network of canals, dating back to Frederick the Great, thruout East Prussia, Pomerellia, Posen and well into Germany. The result was that the Vistula, over all its connecting waterways, formed a great highway of commerce, the main lines of which ran from west to east in harmony with the German Empire. The

entire district with all these connecting waterways formed, indeed, Germany's ''bridge to the east''. Some of the trade, it is true, went down to Danzig, but the greater part of it went further east.

Today, ten years after the incorporation of the Vistula into the Polish Corridor, the geographic, economic and political character of that area is completely reversed. The entire length of the Vistula, from its source in the Carpathian mountains to its mouth on the Baltic lies now within the boundaries of Poland's control; all Poland's chief cities are on its banks; and its valley, for the river itself is not navigable far enough south, is the natural artery of Poland's life—its highway of commerce—but a commerce which runs north and south, not east and west; a commerce, moreover, whose volume is greatly increased because this highway now possesses as its new watershed the wide and fertile frontier of the Polish Republic. At present, some of the trade still goes to Danzig but most of it is now going to Gdynia, the wholly Polish port.

The Germans complain that the loss of the Vistula and its valley has destroyed their currents of trade, their use of all its connecting waterways, consequently their markets and their ''bridge to the east''. They refer to the Corridor as a ''biological anomaly'', as a ''gash through the living flesh of their country''—as if ''Liverpool and her surrounding districts were made a Free State under Portugal''. On the other hand, the Poles claim by recovering the Vistula and its valley, Poland is now an economic unit; that the section now defined by the Vistula forms the natural road to the sea of a great agricultural plain; that this section represents, moreover, the ''narrow waist'' of Europe, the shortest route from the ''Black Sea to the Baltic''—the old cry of Polish nationalism, whose objectives the Polish government is doing all in its power to promote—as witness the railway down the Corridor to Gdynia. What has happened is simply this: within ten years of the drawing of a new frontier, an ancient trade route after centuries of deflection and blockade has returned to its natural bed. And the inevitable result has ensued that the Vistula Valley, racially predominately Polish, and economically predominately German, before the war, has now, ten years after, become both racially

and economically predominately Polish. Indeed, the German population has sunk from 418,000 in 1907 to less than 120,000 in 1927.

For those Germans remaining in the Corridor and for those dwelling in what is left of West Prussia (reduced to one-fourth its former size) along the east bank of the Vistula, the situation is charged with friction. To see it at close range one should spend some time exploring that section of the eastern border. First, he will note that Poland, according to the Treaty which invested her with supervision of the waterways, controls not only the river but also its eastern bank, depriving this portion with its riverain people of all use and advantage of the Vistula. The Treaty did not give Germany, here, even riparian rights. This means, besides its restriction upon trade and movement, that the supervision of the dykes, the spurs and canals built by Germany for the control of floods and of silting are in Polish hands and, according to the Germans, are so neglected in upkeep that the river is a constant menace to the inhabitants of the section, who, it is claimed, draw their very life from the river. Again, he will observe that in order to give Poland a bridgehead on the river, the boundary line was so drawn as to isolate five German villages, separating them from the German hinterland and placing them in Poland; while due to other eccentricities of the boundary, he will see a farmstead whose house is in Poland, whose barnyard is in Germany; a meadow, five of whose grazing cows are in the Fatherland, nine in the Corridor; dykes whose line is bisected seven times by the Corridor frontier.

As our explorer approaches Marienwerder, the seat of local government for the District of West Prussia, the difficulties become acute. But he will be prepared for them, if he has been with German guides, for he will have been invited to alight from his car at regular intervals of so many kilometers along the way and to listen to lectures upon the situation by officials of the District delivered with true German thoroughness, fully documented and illustrated by maps and charts, all efficiently provided with standards so that they may be balanced upon the disputed dykes. For, at Marienwerder, there was formerly a regular highway between East and West Prussia and today it forms the sole access of East Prussia to the Vistula. A light railway serving the dis-

trict leads up to the river. It is no longer used. It is overgrown with grass. There is no ferry for goods. Only residents within ten kilometers of the east bank have the privilege of crossing on a permit, obtainable from Polish authorities at a town twenty kilometers distant, without the usual passports. A Polish guard stands on duty; signs in Polish bar the way.

It is at this point on the river that one's attention is especially directed to its deadness, its lack of shipping. Germans complain that the Poles so neglect its proper upkeep that it is rapidly silting up with shifting sandbanks and that, therefore, its one time active life and service as a commercial highway is fast disappearing. To which the Poles reply that they have no need of it, first, as a connecting waterway, as the Germans had, for it is not connected with their other rivers and its navigability for north and south traffic is extremely limited and tremendously expensive to maintain since it is too rapid and too full of sandbanks. Apparently the Poles prefer, for the present at any rate, to employ the Vistula's valley plain for railroad traffic to serve their own new commercial route from south to north.

Just below Marienwerder is the famous Münsterwalde Bridge, named for the neighboring village. Built at a great expense by Germany in 1906-1909, it crossed the Vistula in five arches, was one of the largest bridges in Europe, carried a railroad, and stood as a symbol of that German west-to-east commercial route which we have already described. Today, it is the only means of communication between Poland and East Prussia, or rather was the sole means, for it is rapidly being demolished by the Poles to whom the Treaty gave it as a bridgehead. Actually, only two spans of it remain standing. To bitter German protest, the Poles reply that they do not need it, its upkeep is expensive, it is old, and they wish to use the material elsewhere! The real reason, of course, is that the Münsterwalde Bridge ran at cross purposes to the new economic, geographic and political situation which has developed since the war, and which, as we have clearly indicated, is shaping itself to run north and south with the new Poland, not east and west as formerly with the old Germany.

East Prussia

Closely related to the issue of the Vistula is the isolation of East Prussia from the Fatherland by the Corridor. It is now an island,

as it were, surrounded by a Polish Sea. And this condition as a cause of nationalistic clash and conflict is extremely grave.

Economically, East Prussia, made up for the most part of extensive forest and farm land, is a cattle, timber and horse-breeding country whose principal market was its neighboring German provinces on the west. That market is now removed twice its former distance by the intervening Corridor. Consequently, East Prussia has lost from one-fourth to one-fifth of her economic outlet for she is today also deprived of her pre-war Russian market to the east. Insecurity hangs like a dark cloud over this province, no one desires to promote production there when the outlook for disposing of it is so dubious. As high as twelve per cent interest is being asked for agricultural credits and the district is suffering from a severe economic depression.

Another aspect of its isolation is, of course, the difficulties of its communication with its base, the Fatherland; although these difficulties are much less than they were five years ago, now that the system of traffic set up by the Convention of 1921 appears to be working smoother than it did at first. There are eight rail lines of connection between Germany and East Prussia crossing the Corridor and Poland affords full freedom of transit to Germans and German goods without passport in "sealed" trains. Today, daily trains run between Berlin and Königsberg and now even between Berlin and Danzig without change. Provided he and his goods travel in these specified trains, the German and his freight can pass through without hindrance or formality. The number of trains, however, is not one-third of what it was before the war; goods traffic, especially if it be indirect, is still subject to all kinds of vexatious restrictions and one hears bitter complaints from the Germans of perishable food stuffs spoiling enroute and cattle dying before they can reach their destination owing to Polish bureaucratic regulations. These may seem trifling things but they all help to increase hatred and discontent.

Finally, East Prussia is badly off strategically, for in event of war it could be isolated completely and quickly overrun, but on the other hand, according to the present arrangements the Poles claim that a German force can be within striking distance of the most important of all Polish highways.

And so might we continue with all the other unexplored issues of the eastern frontier which this discussion has neglected, such as Upper Silesia and the land question within the Corridor itself. We could examine them first through Polish spectacles and then through German as we have done with the others. But always the result would be the same and we should hear the same anti-German, anti-Polish chorus as we have been hearing: "the Germans assert and the Poles reply; the Poles contend and the Germans retort; the Germans claim and the Poles rebut".

One must remember that this national antiphon has been ringing through the centuries with but brief respites since the Middle Ages, only ceasing when Teuton or Slav stiffled the other by complete conquest and subjection. Its mode of expression alone has changed to suit the fashions of a changing world. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as befitted the crude and barbarous standards of the time, Slav and Teuton rivalry was expressed by brute force and its decisions rested upon brute force alone. Teutonic Knights hurled themselves upon the Slavic hordes and Slavic hordes burned and plundered and razed with the sword the territory of their German neighbors. To the Slav, the Teutonic Knight was the cruel and iron vanguard of the *Drang nach Osten* striking the first blows in that war of German imperialism against the east; while to the German, he was the first torch-bearer of *Kultur* bringing Christian faith and German order to a benighted land.

Today, as befits the twentieth century and an industrialized era, Teuton versus Slav nationalism finds its loudest and clearest expression, as we have been recounting it, in economic terms. Therefore, if there is to be any Treaty revision on the eastern frontier, any Locarno for the east, will it not have to be based, not upon political, racial and historic claims, the decisions of brute force; but rather upon the co-operative adjustment of those present vital, economic interests, of which the post-war experience of the last decade affords such an illuminating demonstration.

MARY E. TOWNSEND

GEOGRAPHY IN RELATION TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

It is a sign of great import that most teachers are coming to realize that "subjects" like "history" and "geography" and "economics" are not realities of living experience but rather devices to serve the pedagogical needs of the schoolmaster or the administrative needs of school officers. A teacher can only be engaged to teach a subject or a group of subjects, otherwise we should have wild chaos like unto a course of consecutive reading in a twenty-volume encyclopaedia. The result of the scrapping of all boundaries was brilliantly illustrated in some of the old university lectureships where the professor of geology spent most of his time on astronomy and the course in physical geography was famous for its novelties on bee-keeping and horse-breeding. But if we are interested in what Ramsay MacDonald on his last visit to America so happily termed "the wider unities of a humane civilization" we shall want to look across the boundary fences of the school room, after rendering our duty to the "disciplines", and with unfettered mind trace the realities of living experience even in their naive and unordered manifestations.

Our first discovery is that nothing remains fixed, or, as the Greeks put it, "all changes". In a changing world—indeed, an ever more rapidly changing world—one has difficulty enough in discovering reality, but when we go a step further and attempt to set up a philosophy that bears upon that elusive reality we are likely to be swept from our moorings altogether and to agree with James, the psychologist, who described thinking as "the activity of a harrassed animal in a changing world".

This has led a great many men, especially in the post-war period, to attempt to simplify their philosophy and to bring knowledge and experience into a new harmony. The stage and the newspaper, no less than science, religion, and business, exhibit these tracings of a new (and chiefly post-war) design. Broadly speaking, we are of two classes when we attempt to set up a philosophy of our own. The first class is so limited in numbers (and we are all so modest in

making pretensions to membership in the class!) that we may almost disregard it entirely—it is the class of geniuses; and their attitude toward the world has been touched off by George Bernard Shaw, who summarizes his philosophy by saying, "I strive to communicate my bent to my fellows". The much larger class of men and women to which you and I belong, the class that is made up of people who do not pretend to be geniuses, has had its case stated by a friend of mine of whom I recently asked the question, "What's it all about, and what are you going to do about it?" His answer gives me continuing satisfaction. It was, "I strive to react intelligently to the forces about me." To react intelligently to the forces about one is sometimes to frustrate those forces, sometimes to seize and direct them, and only in a limited and thoughtful sense to conform. Had this not been the case in times past, had there not been men who give an upward or at least a different spiritual deflection to the forces of life, a humane civilization could hardly have come into being.

The moment we think of ourselves as frustrating or deflecting any of the forces of life we come up against the very practical question of knowledge. If we know too little of any one subject, if we have not mastered at least one technique, we lack expertness and accuracy and the special forms of mastery without which any understanding of the world is difficult to come by. And on the other hand, if we do not have some knowledge of related fields all effort at improving a civilization is likely to be without good result because it is bound to be haphazard or one-sided, our view of the scene being too narrowly focussed. This brings us directly to the topic upon which I have been asked to speak, the relation of geography to the other social sciences.

We might as well admit at the start that the subject is controversial and that this is not the time for dicta. We ought also to recognize that the subject has two sides on only one of which I can pretend to speak. I do not pretend to be a social scientist in the ordinary sense of that term nor have I any special standing in history or economics. The most that I shall attempt to do is to open a geographical window and point out the features of the landscape as they present themselves to me.

I suppose we might as well lay the ghost of determinism right at the start. I am not going to advocate that geography explains

life or that its laws act with undeviating or even exceptional effect upon man. I am led to make this reservation, at once, through the force of a great truth that we have learned from the physical sciences, namely, that *mankind has not yet discovered any law of universal application.* A so-called "law" is only a convenient term for a generalization. When I first studied physics the precision of "physical laws" appealed powerfully to my mind in contrast to the necessarily blurred outlines of much of history. For example, I could learn with complete faith that the resistance of the air to a moving body varies as the square of the velocity. I can still remember the great shock it gave me to learn in the actual solution of a problem later on in life that this generalization was true only within a rather narrow range of velocities. It was healthy to learn that even the physical world had blurred outlines if you only looked far enough.

At the moment I am trying to break down in your mind that sharp distinction that you have probably all felt between the physical and the social sciences. There is something so clean-cut about a physical principle or a mathematical formula that we are likely to think of it as far more exact than the man to whom these abstractions of the material world are commonplaces of thought. To be a science a subject should by definition fulfill three conditions: It should: (1) have its facts arranged in a systematic order; (2) rationally explain given conditions in accordance with established laws; (3) predict the future course of development or lead the way to the discovery of new laws. But these things science does, not in any absolute or infallible sense, but rather with moderate degrees of accuracy only, and the degree of accuracy varies with the nature of the facts. In almost every subject, whether it be history or astronomy, the data of the subject may be divided into two distinct groups, 1) a group of facts capable of rather rigid scientific treatment, 2) a group of facts so related to the changing spirit of man and his inventions that less importance should be attached to the matter of laws and much more importance to *the point of view.* You cannot treat commercial geography or political history as you can treat mechanics or light or chemical elements. Nor can you attribute to them the more nearly immutable qualities of material things. Their significance lies too

much in the point of view of the living generation for us to seek "laws" that range over the centuries of man's evolution as a social being.

I should like here to suggest that we still pay altogether too much respect to so-called laws and too little respect to "groups of facts". One who is always looking for causes, for laws, for what is often called "the fundamental explanations" of things, misses what might be termed a law that overshadows the whole of knowledge and life, namely, that much that happens is hit and miss, impulse, mere juxtaposition in time or space; in short, mere happening. But the instant a thing happens that instant it is endowed with the possibility of becoming a force in the world, a thing to be reckoned with, the cause of something else. In the search for illustrations of laws let us not overlook the happenings, even the accidents of time and life.

Having paid my respects to the accidental in life I wish now to direct your thought to that which flows from the event or condition preceding, and because you are teachers of history and I am a geographer let us confine ourselves for a moment to some interactions between the sets of facts that bear the names of these two disciplines. The historian often falls back upon a convenient phrase "soil and climate". Some day I should like to make a list of the number of times in which these two nouns are placed side by side in the explanations of man and his ways that are included in history teaching. In fact, I think I could make out a case against the historians as the worst sinners with respect to the so-called influences of geographical environment. You are so much freer and wilder in seeking causes amongst the rocks and winds and streams of environment! It is an old controversy that we here point to. As one writer has cynically put it, "If environment counts, then, *does a smooth land produce a smooth people*?" Or, to phrase it more seriously, "Do the mountains defend the army or does the army defend the mountains?" Of course any explanation which we might evolve almost immediately brings us into difficulties. A facetious person will point out that kangaroos have long hind legs and short front legs because they grazed too long uphill over mountainous topography in geologic ages long since passed. It is not easy to see, even in a humorous sense, what it

was in the Connecticut landscape or the soil and climate of that commonwealth that led to the development of the type of Yankee that specialized in wooden nutmegs—though I am not sure but what recent political events may throw some light on even this puzzling question!

We get along in the argument when we discover and admit that the European dies in the environment in which the Australian Black nourishes himself and that some of the first argonauts to the California goldfields died of thirst where later comers found water only a little way down. When a sagebrush desert can be turned into wheatfields by the application of the technique of dry-farming, it is evident that it is not nature that determines the law of life but the reaction between nature and the ideas that men carry about in their heads. Granted that the environment counts, the breed of men counts for much more, and the type of culture counts hardly less. In short, nature offers the opportunity; she nourishes no one; she gives man a chance—the same chance that she gives to the seed and the star. Man selects wisely or unwisely and succeeds or fails accordingly. Faith won't change nature, enthusiasm won't change nature, patriotism won't change nature. But Australian politicians (who confuse rainfall and loyalty to country) notwithstanding, faith, enthusiasm, and patriotism in varying proportions (and many other things as well) make the differences between individuals and countries and policies and history, as they are deflected, increased, or diminished by the environment in which they find themselves. They form a far more complex set of facts and relationships than anything that we can find in the physical universe. We are told by Cattell that more complex than all of the motions of the solar system is the play of a child of five during a single day. We can measure matter, we can experiment upon it, we can change its quality a little or fundamentally, but "human behavior tends to elude experimental and quantitative methods".

As time goes on everyone who experiences and senses the realities of living experience must be aware of the importance in any study of man of the time-honored phrase "it seems to me". Actual experience of life and abundant analogies from the physical world lead one at times to regard pretty much the whole universe of things and men as a matter of "it seems to me". The history of circumstantial evidence supplies abundant illustrations. In my

own experience there is the example of the bank cashier who after a day's hunt for a package two feet long, a foot wide, and six inches high, wrapped in brown paper, tied with a white string, and with my name upon it, finally confessed failure and went to the treasurer of the bank, to whom he was ready to swear, to his own hurt, that he had received such a package and had put it in the vault of the bank. By accident a few weeks afterward I found the material in the alleged package safely stowed in a filing case. The cashier had never seen the package; he had only heard my description of it. Yet six months after he had heard the description he was ready to say with complete conviction that he remembered personally receiving the package and gave the most convincing and vivid description of that which he had never seen.

Did Clemenceau call Wilson a pro-German and angrily leave the room in which the Supreme Council was sitting? President Wilson said that he did. One of the "non-combatants" in the room, the French interpreter, Monteaux, said that Clemenceau remarked "If you give me neither the Left Bank of the Rhine nor the Sarre Basin you are treating the Germans better than the French". Yet history must take account of the reports of both principals, for whatever Clemenceau may have said, actually and literally, it is equally important and possibly more important to know what President Wilson thought he said! In the web of complex human relationships there is trouble enough for the historian and when he tries to relate that web to the earth, the difficulties increase enormously. And yet relate his facts to the earth he does and must. How can the history of the British Empire be studied or its economic development traced in any sensible or useful or "scientific" manner unless we know something of the *lands* and *climates* of that geographically diversified aggregation of which Lord Balfour said that its different characteristics, its different history, its different stages of evolution defy classification and that as a whole it "bears no real resemblance to any other political organization which now exists or has ever yet been tried".

When it comes to the explanations of things the geographer has one contribution to make which neither the economist nor the historian is able to make with like effect. The geographer does not stop with the sociological set-up or with the historical narrative or explanation or sequence. He has acquired expertness with a

quite definite technique that enables him to appraise the natural resources of a region, to make such study of those hackneyed terms "soil and climate" "relief" and "space relations" as to give his work the quality of forecast without which, according to our accepted definitions, the work of the sociologist and historian is really not scientific at all. Here is no question of overlapping disciplines. Here we are not concerned with boundary lines between subjects. Here is no question of duplication. We may be able to do without geography when it comes to curing a bad economic condition or changing the social structure or the social practices of a people, but when it comes to the more intelligent development of the natural resources of a region, we cannot do without the principles of geography and what is more important, the geographical point of view. To discuss the relation of a people to its natural resources requires the handling of physical data, a special training in the technique required to *apply physical laws to given regional environments*, all of which are familiar things to the geographer and quite unfamiliar things to the historian and the economist. This is not to suppose that forecast of human events and the cure of a bad human condition are the aims of geography exclusively or, in a given case, at all. There are a great many things that humanity appraises without attempting to cure. Not all problems are solvable. To put it more forcibly, some problems are definitely and defiantly insoluble. Some forces are incalculable, human as well as divine. We can weigh the planets and forecast an eclipse but no one is so bold as to predict the outcome of the Eighteenth Amendment. We don't even know the ultimate effect of a single fact such as the existence of 3,000,000 miles of road in the United States or one mile of road for every square mile of territory. A Chinese proverb sets this truth in relief: "When two men can not agree on the price of an onion who shall decide what happened in the time of Yu?" We are like the small boy who couldn't see how the Chambers of Commerce of the United States contrived to place a river beside every big city! We are still puzzling over the question raised by Henry George, "Why don't poor men of the cities go to the country!" Mostly our attitude is one of amazement. We are little better than the cowboy at the Grand Canyon who exclaimed: "My God, something's happened here!"

There are many events for which we need no forecast if we once know what the facts really are. We happen to know accurately enough the history of the Nile floods for 960 years and we know that only four times in that millenium has the river been as low as it was in 1913-1914. Merely to know that fact is to know of the negligibly small chance of an extremely low Nile within a limited period of years in the immediate future. Facts and more facts of this character are what has given man his mastery over the earth to a large degree—he has seized facts and directed his destiny to a desired end. We should no longer represent Atlas as bowed under the weight of the earth but rather as in an eighteenth century map, standing on top of the earth and, so to speak, guiding its whirling destinies.

If the men who made the Age of Discovery were to compare their lot with those today they would vigorously assert that we, not they, are in the Age of Discovery, for they would see a gravity-defying man flying upside down in the air or walking in an air-bubble helmet on the floor of the sea or hitchhiking on the tail of a storm, like Eckener between the Sea of Okhotsk and Tokyo in his flight of last August.

Let us set ourselves a problem in the interpretation of a process under our eyes, in order to gain the point of view I am advocating, of infinitely complex relationships and an almost infinitely varied nature, with geography entering at every turn as a necessary element to be taken account of in the appraisal of a situation, in the partial explanations that we are able to give. Let's take a familiar object and event: a clock is ticking as it stands on the mantelpiece. Ask the first half dozen people who come into the room what makes it tick. You would suppose we could agree on that simple fact when we can so readily agree on the causes of the fall of Rome or the decline of feudalism in Europe. I tried the question on my family a few weeks ago with such effect that I am led to advocate it as a new family game. One says, "the pendulum", another says, "an escapement", another says "gravity", another says "man". And in a sense all are right and each is wrong. It's the whole of the business that we have to take into account and there is no one fundamental cause.

A number of us are just now attempting a synthesis of that sort in a project supported by the Social Science Research Council for

the study of regions of pioneer settlement. The attempt is being made to set up a *science of settlement*, first by finding out what people are doing in the pioneer belts of the earth and second to reduce their doings to generalities, which, if you like, we can call "laws". If at that point we are unable to predict the course of mankind in the pioneer lands of the earth at least we shall be able to appraise their situation and to tell them where life is good and life is bad and probably give them some very cogent reasons why it is so, with, we hope, great effects upon millions of men in many different environments not only in their economic but their social life and possibly also in their national destiny. It is in the pioneer zones that we find the greatest experimentation in varying the relation of the physical world to man's well-being, in changing social institutions under the stress of a new environment, the pain, if you like, of an evolving mankind. There the world is on a hinge and the pioneer wants to move it. Nature laid out the world badly and the pioneer must improve it on the spot.

In order to focus the things that I have said upon a concrete case that is more likely to stay in your mind than these scattered illustrations, I should like to have you turn to Latin America and see how the geographic environment has related itself to the fate of a score of countries extending more than a quarter way around the world and containing environments almost as diverse as the whole world.

We are almost daily informed of the differences between the Latin Americans and ourselves. It is easy to say that these differences spring quite largely from European travel and education on the part of successive generations of young Latin Americans. But their philosophy of life is less European than it is specifically Latin American and derivative of a specific culture that enjoyed a long period of unfolding on the Iberian Peninsula. The qualities of Latin-American culture are as rationally the outgrowth of the experience of the Spanish and Portuguese peoples and of transplantation in a specific environment in the New World as anything we can point to in the natural relations of people to environment anywhere in the north temperate zone.

During the long period between the early Moorish invasions of Spain and the fall of Granada, that is to say, for a period of over seven hundred years, Spanish life was profoundly affected by con-

flict with the Moor. The tradition of war was maintained almost uninterruptedly and church and state stood side by side in the organization of that knightly Christian cavalry that took the lead in pressing forward the boundaries of the Spanish kingdoms. You see that history reflected in the literature of Spain. Several years ago I turned the pages of the volume of Hispanic Anthology, reading the verses one by one, and found practically the entire book concerned with three major topics: religion, war, and romantic love. Here we do not find the abundant nuances, the moods, the fragments, that one will meet customarily in anthologies of verse. On the contrary, the poet takes one of the three major themes and bears down rather heavily upon his subject.

Naturally there were social consequences as a result of the "set" of the current of life in such definite channels. The mounted man, perhaps a member of the nobility, frequently a member of some religious order, was a member of a specific and recognised social group out of which came the persons who ruled Spain. The distinction between the high and the low ran through society:

"God bless those who labor
"And we who guide them."

This is the aristocratic view of life. It represents a distinction between labor and no labor, the working class and the privileged class. How strange this seems to us today! Many of the richest and the most "privileged" in our society are known to be among the most industrious. "I must get back to my job" is an expression one hears perhaps as commonly on the lips of a millionaire as upon those of a "laborer".

When the conquest of the New World began there came aristocrats in large numbers, but with them went also adventurers of almost every type, including men of the lowest degree. Once in the New World they might have formed a society among themselves, keeping the old gradations of society at home. Doubtless this might have happened in Latin America just as it did in the English colonies, because there was far more reason for it, taking into account only the backgrounds of Spanish and English life. But it was unnecessary to make such a division. Nature offered an easier way out. In the New World there was a dark-skinned people in great numbers, obviously in a lower state of culture, and,

being easily exploited, they must of necessity have been inferior! Hence all of the Spaniards could be lords or caballeros. God had fixed a great gulf between the conqueror and the conquered. Concessions and grants could be made generously. It was a new country and it was wide. For every man there was, in a sense, a principality. I do not mean this literally, but I do mean that the situation was favorable to an extraordinary degree for a New World blossoming of the main traits of Spanish character. Here went on with redoubled enthusiasm the contest between heathen and Christian. Here was war and Christianization, service to the church and all the heroic repetitions that appealed to the Spaniard as a reliving of the life of the classical period.

All this might not have come to pass if the Spaniards had not brought with them the habit of living in self-contained groups. The institution of the hacienda was developed on a great scale, thus enabling the settler to defy time and distance. He could go anywhere; and the wide spread, the deep penetration, the extraordinary deployment, of Spanish colonization in the New World is one of its most striking characteristics. Thus the second half of the nineteenth century, the period in which most of the railroads were built, witnessed, curiously enough, a drawing-in of the limits of settlement in many remarkable instances, as man became tied to the new economic system of which the railroad was the symbol and in which *time* came to be more and more important. The speed of transportation now became a vital part of the process of moving goods and men. How different the colonial period! Even today the hacienda system makes possible the occupation of farm land far, far beyond the strict economic limits of our own civilization in the United States. We have no class upon whose shoulders we can drop so heavy a load as that which the Spaniard drops upon the lowest ranks of his society. He is intent upon maintaining the privileges and luxuries of a class: all is well if these privileges and luxuries are being enjoyed; all is wrong if they are taken away, no matter what the reason may be.

The habit of thought that men of such a civilization maintain is one that is totally incongruous to the institution of democracy referred to in the successive constitutions that came into being after the Wars of Liberation. The slogans of democracy were adopted, the forms, the words, but not the spirit. Society re-

mained as before. The emblems of power changed, but power remained in the hands of the privileged few. Power was transferred from the foreign Spanish aristocrat who came over to rule in the King's name to a class that was socially lower, but this did not bridge the gulf between rulers and ruled. In unbroken sequence the characteristics of Spanish life may be traced through the colonial period and the period of liberation down to our own time.

The physical environment played a great part in this persistence of traits and institutions. A people is normally more flexible in its habits of thoughts in a new environment. Why has Latin America been the great exception? Wherever irrigation could be practised the immemorial union was made between capital and labor, as in all societies that have developed in arid lands. In fact, irrigation without coöperation is unthinkable. Here the control of water is the essence of life. Government is built around the fact. This was true in Assyria and Egypt, just as it is true of Egypt today and of central-northern Chile or Peru. The wide extent of land whose cultivation depends upon the regulated use of water is an outstanding feature of Latin America. Equally important is the organization of a tropical plantation, with specialized production, export, and transportation. The whole thing depends upon coöperation, with brains at the top and much rough and heavy labor at the bottom. Moreover, to produce, transport, and sell requires machines and facilities that can only come into being when there is capital available, and capital in a new country is extremely hard to obtain. It is in the hands of a much smaller class than is the case in a long-established society.

To me the case of Latin America is profoundly interesting because it shows, better than any other example I know, the importance in a study of the present life of the people of its historical background. Nor can I see anything at all in geographical determinism or the influence of geographical environment as a force acting by itself. I see both the forest environment and the desert environment mastered by the same institution; the hacienda works in both cases but for quite different reasons. And in both cases it admirably maintains those social and political forms that came into being more than a milennium since and that by an extraordinary set of circumstances have been able to continue in the New World as well as in the old because they so admirably express certain basic

human qualities—love of power, love of privilege, pride of caste, sheer human vanity, and the desire for gain which supports all the others.

What a different story might be told if the New World had been uninhabited and there had been no comparatively dense populations to exploit. But there they were, and there was an environment in which irrigation and organized coöperative living had been practised as in the land of the conquerors. Here it was easy to continue the traditions of the race. Geography played a part in the scheme but it was only a part. What interests me is not the play of a single factor, or group of factors called "the geographical environment", but rather the whole scheme of life in its waywardness as well as in its organised aspects; and how it was continued with such marvelous success and with only minor modifications over so many hundreds of years. It is this fact which gives to the revolution in Mexico the highest scientific interest and that interest will increase as similar changes take place in other Latin-American countries where the land question is even now equally acute.

Isaiah Bowman

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1928-29

April 11, 1929

Receipts

Cash balance May 19, 1928	$	1386.50
Dues collected during fiscal year 1928-1929		584.00
Advertisements in PROCEEDINGS		107.50
Interests on bank deposits		26.79
Sale of PROCEEDINGS		58.00
Voluntary Contributions		52.75
Unaccounted for		6.00
Total Receipts	$	2,221.54

Expenditures

Expenses for speakers at meetings	$	5.00
Expenses of secretary in attending meetings		36.23
Office equipment		6.10
Postage and stationery		119.31
Multigraphing notices		35.42
Clerical assistance and postage		105.49
Publishing PROCEEDINGS		530.31
Publishing Membership List		14.50
Check to Ginn & Company deposited by error*		30.00
Balances on hand		1339.18
	$	2,221.54

*Ginn & Company sent $30.00 check in error which was deposited in banking receipt of instructions for disposition.

Audited and found correct.

Genevieve Marsh

Elmer Louis Keyser

Lena C. Van Bibber,

Secretary-Treasurer

REPORT OF MEMBERSHIP

November 30, 1929

Members enrolled in 1929		
Paid-up membership		
Paid before May meeting	361	
Recorded since May meeting	199	
New Members—since May meeting	15	
Total paid-up membership		575
Non-paying members		1
Members in arrears		
For one year	64	
For two years	14	
Total in arrears		78
Total enrollment		654
Names dropped from roll since May meeting		
Resigned	22	
Not located	1	
Dropped from enrollment in accordance with constitutional provision	5	
Deceased	1	
Total dropped from roll		29

LENA C. VAN BIBBER,
Secretary

CONSTITUTION

Article I. *Name and Purpose*

This Association shall be known as the "Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland". Its purpose shall be two-fold: First, to advance the study and teaching of history and Other Social Sciences through discussion and publication and, secondly, to promote personal acquaintance among teachers and students in these fields.

Article II. *Membership*

Any one interested in the study or teaching of history and other social sciences in the Middle States and Maryland shall be eligible to membership. Application for membership shall be accepted or rejected by a vote of the Council at its meeting next following the receipt of such application.

Article III. *Officers*

Section 1: There shall be a President, a Vice-President and a Secretary-Treasurer, elected by ballot at the annual spring meeting. Their duties shall be those usually attached to their respective offices. The Secretary-Treasurer shall carefully preserve records of all meetings of the Council and of all business sessions of the Association; and these and other important records and correspondence shall be kept on file in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2: The general directions of the affairs of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of the three officers, the former presidents of the Association, four elective members, two of whom shall be chosen annually for terms of two years, and one delegate each appointed annually by such local associations as the Council may from time to time designate for this purpose. In 1927 two elective members of the Council shall be chosen for one year and two for two years.

Article IV. *Meetings*

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at the time and place designated by the Council.

Article V. *Fiscal Year and Dues*

The fiscal year shall begin with the annual business meeting. The membership fee shall be one dollar, payable annually in April for the ensuing year. Members who have not paid their dues for the current year shall not be entitled to receive the publication of the Association while in arrears, and members who are two years in arrears and have received three notices of their indebtedness shall be regarded as having forfeited their membership.

Article VI. *Amendments*

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting by a two-thirds vote of those present, notice of the proposed amendment having been given in advance of the meeting.

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES

University of California Library, Berkeley, California.
Pomona College Library, Claremont, California.
Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, California.
University of Southern California Library, Los Angeles, California.

The College Library, Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado.

Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

General Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

The Chicago Public Library, Chicago, Illinois.
The John Crerar Library, Chicago, Illinois.
General Library, University of Chicago, Chicago ,Illinois.
University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Illinois.

De Pauw University Library, Greencastle, Indiana.
Logansport Public Library, Logansport, Indiana.

Iowa State College Library, Ames, Iowa.
Columbia College Library, Dubuque, Iowa.
State University of Iowa Library, Iowa City, Iowa.
Cornell College Library, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

Kellogg Library, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas.
State Agricultural College Library, Manhattan, Kansas.

Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore, Maryland.
Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Maryland.

Converse Memorial Library, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Graduate School of Education Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Smith College Library, Northampton, Massachusetts.
Wellesley College Library, Wellesley 81, Massachusetts.

General Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
The Public Library, Detroit, Michigan.

University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

University of Missouri Library, Columbia, Missouri.
St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

State University Library, Missoula, Montana.

Nebraska University Library, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Public Library, Newark, New Jersey.
Rutgers College Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
State Teachers College Library, Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

New York State Library, New York University, Albany, New York.
Alfred University Library, Alfred, New York.
Wells College Library, Aurora, New York.
Brooklyn Public Library, Brooklyn, New York.
Buffalo Public Library, Buffalo, New York.
The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, New York.
Hobart College Library, Geneva, New York.
Colgate University Library, Hamilton, New York.
Teachers College Library, Columbia University, New York.
New York Public Library, New York City.
Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, New York.

North Carolina College for Women Library, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Carnegie Library, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio.
College for Women Library, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.
Oregon State Library, Salem, Oregon.

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania.
University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

University of Texas Library, Austin, Texas.

Lawrence College Library, Appleton, Wisconsin.
University of Wisconsin Library, Madison, Wisconsin.

THE COUNCIL

Officers

President

CARLTON J. H. HAYES,

Columbia University.

Vice-President

GEORGE J. JONES,

Central High School, Washington, D. C.

Secretary-Treasurer

LENA C. VAN BIBBER,

Maryland State Normal School at Towson.

Additional Members of the Council

Former Presidents

C. M. Andrews, Yale University.
J. H. Robinson, New School for Social Research, New York City.
C. A. Herrick, Girard College, Philadelphia.
Eleanor L. Lord, Box 50, Rosemont, Pa.
H. V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania.
James Sullivan, Assistant Commissioner for Secondary Education, Albany, N. Y.
Edgar Dawson, Hunter College.
A. E. McKinley, Editor, Historical Outlook.
Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University.
J. M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University.
Jessie C. Evans, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia.
M. S. Brown, New York University.
L. R. Schuyler, College of the City of New York.
D. C. Knowlton, Yale University.
A. K. Heckle, University of Missouri.
R. W. Kelsey, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
J. M. Gambrill, Teachers College, Columbia University.
F. E. Moyer, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.
J. H. Latane, Johns Hopkins University.
J. L. Barnard, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
W. E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania.
H. C. Carman, Columbia University.
Kathryn E. C. Carrigan, Atlantic City High School.

Elective Members

Cleora Sutch, High School, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Frances Morehouse, Hunter College.
D. Montford Melchoir, Girard College, Philadelphia.
Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania.

Delegates from Conferences

James A. Barkley, History Club of Delaware.
Mildred M. Coughlin, History Teachers Association of Maryland.
John T. Greenan, New Jersey Association of Teachers of Social Studies.
Clarence W. Miner, New York Council for Social Studies.
Rachel Selecter, History Club of Philadelphia.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Note:—The arrangement in this list is: (1) name, (2) official address, (3) residence. The city or postoffice address is given only once if it is the same for both (2) and (3).

Adams, Charles E., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 5315 Bosworth Ave.

Adams, Gladys Marion, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 835 Drexel Ave., Drexel Hill, Pa.

Adele, Sister Mary, Villa Maria College, Immaculata, Pa.

Adriance, Robert I., High School, East Orange, N. J., 178 N. Walnut St.

Albert, Grace, The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., The College Inn.

Allen, Freeman H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 44 Broad St.

Allen, Joseph Dana, Headmaster, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 200 Hicks St.

Allen, Margaret E., William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 610 S. 48 St.

Allison, William H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 15 E. Kendrick Ave.

Ames, Herman V., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 203 St. Mark's Square.

Ammarell, Raymond R., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 41 Llewellyn Ave., Hawthorne, N. J.

Amos, Esther Bosley, 3201 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.

Andrew, L. Elizabeth, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.

Andrews, Ada Mary, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.

Andrews, Charles M., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Andrews, Elizabeth Agnes, Miss Wright's School, Byrn Mawr, Pa., 307 Berkeley Road, Merion, Pa.

Andrews, Grace, James Madison High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 65 Jefferson Ave.

Applegate, Mrs. Stella S., Executive Clerk, New Jersey State Teachers Association, Room 304 Stacy-Trent Hotel, Trenton, N. J., 130 W. State St.

Arnold, Herbert F., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 221 E. Oakdale Ave., Glenside, Pa.

Arthur, L. Louise, Bryant High School, Long Island City, N. Y., 4144 Gosman Ave.

Austin, Margaret F., James Monroe High School, New York City, 2406 Frisby Ave., Bronx.

Bacon, Edna Lorine, East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 87 Fourth Ave.

Bader, Harriet, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Bagley, William C., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 410 Riverside Drive.

Baldwin, Frances Elizabeth, 147 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md.

Baldwin, James Fosdick, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 160 College Ave.

Bamberger, Florence Eilau, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 2204 Park Ave.

Bamberger, Stella H., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2204 Park Ave.

Banvard, Adele F., High School, East Orange, N. J., 73 N. Arlington Ave.

Barbour, Violet, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 158 College Ave.

Barker, Corinne M., New York City Training School for Teachers, New York City, Glenwood Lodge, 390 N. Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.

Barker, John B., Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 4127 Park Heights Ave.

Barker, James A., University of Delaware, Newark, Del., 319 Springhill Ave., Wilmington, Del.

Barnard, James Lynn, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Barnes, Harry Elmer, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., 108 Maynard Road.

Barrick, Willina, Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 2540 Boulevard.

Barth, Laura Florence, Supervising Principal, 2020 Frankford Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Bartlett, L. J., Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 110 Reading Ave.

Bassett, Janet, 3218 Fait Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Bausman, Naomi, Westfield Friends' School, Riverton, N. J.

Beard, Charles A., New Milford, Conn., 27 W. 67 St., New York City.

Beatman, Augustus S., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 527 W. 121 St.

Beaumont, Jr., André Alden, New York University, New York City, 37 Cleveland Lane, Princeton, N. J.

Bechtel, Mary D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Beck, B. W., State Teachers College, Kutztown, Pa.

Becker, Carl Lotus, Cornell University, 249 Goldwin Smith Hall, Ithaca, N. Y., 109 W. Upland Road.

Beebe, Dorothy L., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 276 Sixth St.

Belcher, Katherine F., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 819 Grove St., Elizabeth, N. J.
Belt, J. Edward, William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 3039 Green St.
Bennett, Martha Crosby, Morris High School, New York City, 414 W. 121 St.
Bernstein, Samuel, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.
Berryman, Mrs. L. B., Stuart Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 235 First St., N. E.
Biemiller, Andrew J., 20 Rodney Dormitory, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Billingslea, John Smith, Upper Darby High School, Drexel Hill, Pa., 4010 Huey Ave.
Billow, Milton Oscar, William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 2419 N. Fifth St.
Birdsall, Jean, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Black, A. M., 318 W. 57 St., New York City.
Blake, Julia E., Georgiancourt College, Lakewood, N. J.
Blom, E. William, High School, East Orange, N. J., 156 Church St., Nutly, N. J.
Boring, Lydia T., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., The Larchmont, 47 and Larchwood Aves.
Bowden, Witt, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Wallingford, Pa.
Bowman, Daniel Hudson, McBurney School, New York City, 269 Academy St., Jersey City, N. J.
Boyce, Harriet L., High School, Passaic, N. J.
Boyt, S. Ethel, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 210 Park Ave., Swarthmore, Pa.
Bradshaw, Bessie E., High School, Cambridge, Md., 109 Church St.
Brady, Mildred, High School, Fort Lee, N. J., 1041 Palisade Ave., Palisade, N. J.
Brandt, Walther I., 611 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Brainerd, Jessie J., Potomac (Private) School, Washington, D. C., 2626 Garfield St.
Brebner, J. B., Columbia University, New York City.
Brewer, William M., 1010 Fairmont St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Bridgman, Anne T., Morris High School, New York City, 320 W. 83 St.
Britten, Marion G., High School, Passaic, N. J., 5 Albion St.
Brockway, Thomas Parmalee, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 250 Prince George St.
Brooks, Rebecca B., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 2417 N. Calvert St.
Brown, Elizabeth Virginia, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 2742 N. Charles St.
Brown, J. Franklin, Editor, The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City, 51 Ellenton Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y.
Brown, Louise Fargo, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Brown, Marshall Stewart, Dean of Faculties, New York University, New York City, 19 Fairview St., Yonkers, N. Y.

Brown, Stella E., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.,
4213 Belmar Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Bryan, Alfred C., High School of Commerce, New York City,
416 Clermont Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Buchanan, Mary F., Junior No. 3 School, Trenton, N. J., 439 Bellevue Ave.
Buckle, Alice Isabel, High School, Conshohocken, Pa., 134 E. Fourth St.
Buckley, Margaret H., 5925 Falls Road, Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md.
Bucknam, Kate D., Eastern High School, Washington, D. C.,
1417 Belmont St., N. W.
Bunnell, Theora J., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C.,
3000 Connecticut Ave.
Burch, Henry Reed, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
5208 Drexel Road.
Burlingame, Anne Elizabeth, Butler Hall, Hunter College, New York City,
88 Morningside Drive.
Butler, Mrs. Elva R., Preston, Caroline County, Md.
Buzby, Ethel, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
3926 Locust St.
Bye, Edgar C., State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 318 E. King St.
Byrom, Reba A., Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.,
501 Carpenter Lane, Germantown.
Cairnes, Laura J., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 4008 Roland Ave.
Calman, Alvin R., Upsala College, East Orange, N. J., 318 Prospect St.
Campbell, Elsie, High School, Morristown, N. J., 94 Western Ave.
Campbell, May B., Walton Junior High School, New York City,
2040 Seventh Ave.
Carman, Harry James, Columbia University, New York City,
21 Claremont Ave.
Carr, Charles F., High School, East Orange, N. J., 28 S. Walnut St.
Carrigan, Kathryn E. C., High School, Atlantic City, N. J.,
131 N. Richards Ave., Ventnor, N. J.
Carter, Alfred, George School, Bucks County, Pa.
Carver, Elizabeth W., School No. 24, Wilmington, Del., Aikin, Md.
Caspari, Alice C., Junior High School No. 52, Baltimore, Md.,
701 Lake Ave., Roland Park.
Cassell, Hannah F., High School, Chester, N. J., 1218 W. Seventh St.
Catherine, Sister Mary, Holy Trinity High School, Washington, D. C.,
3513 D St., N. W.
Challis, C. E., Columbia Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
331 Quackenbos St., N. W.
Chandor, Valentine L., Headmistress, Miss Chandor's School for Girls,
137 E. 62 St., New York City.
Cheronny, Helen E., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Cheyney, Edward Potts, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.,
259 S. 44 St.
Clapp, Roger E. E., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.,
110 St. Paul's Road, Ardmore, Pa.

Clark, Bessie S., Trenton Normal School, Trenton, N. J.
Clark, Chester Roy, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 1514 Columbia Road, N. W.
Clark, Florence R., Evander Childs High School, New York City, 2 Alden Place, Bronxville, N. Y.
Clark, Marion, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., Apt. 19, 1657 Lamont St., N. W.
Clark, Marion G., Director of Elementary Education, Montclair, N. J., 74 Montague Place.
Clark, Mary Emily, Principal, George Biddle High School, Cecilton, Md.
Clarke, Mary Patterson, Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.
Clauder, Anna Cornelia, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3334 N. Sixteenth St.
Cleaver, Clarence G., College Representative, Ginn and Company, New York City, 8426-110 St., Richmond Hill.
Cockram, Edith Mary, Junior High School No. 4, Trenton, N. J., 36 Prospect St.
Coffin, Mrs. Elizabeth F., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 140 N. Fifteenth St.
Coleman, Kathryn F., 37 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Conner, Frances S., Central High School, Scranton, Pa., 2440 N. Washington Ave.
Conner, Sallie J., 106 Longwood Road, Baltimore, Md.
Conovitz, Michael, Central High School, Newark, N. J., 64 Monticello Ave.
Cooper, Caroline L., High School, Wilmington, Del., 1314 W. Seventh St.
Corlies, James A., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Cornelia, Mother Mary, Academy of the Holy Child, 3833 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Cornish, H. R., School No. 4, Paterson, N. J.
Coughlin, Mildred M., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 3823 Beech Ave.
Coulomb, Charles Augustin, District Superintendent of Schools, District No. 1, Harrington School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4249 Girard Ave.
Cowan, Helen, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
Crall, F. Frank, High School, McKeesport, Pa., 1816 Willow St.
Crowley, Mrs. Kathleen C., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3934 New Hampshire Ave.
Curtis, A. Gertrude, Walnut Hills High School, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2409 Ashland Ave.
Custer, John S., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Dales, Frances E., High School, Passaic, N. J., 170 Broadway, Apt. D-8.
Dalgliesh, Harold, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Darby, Julian Paul, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 122 Spring Ave.
Dargo, Nathan, Seward Park High School, New York City, 742 Lafayette Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Davis, Mabelle E., High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.

Dawson, Edgar, Hunter College, New York City, 55 E. 76 St.
Deane, Rev. Charles J., Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Fordham University, New York City.
Deck, Clara M., Senior High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., West Leesport, Pa.
Denison, Isabel Noyes, State Normal School, Potsdam, N. Y., 62 Elm St.
Deutsch, Arthur, Seward Park High School, New York City, 113 Grant Ave.
DeWald, Bertha, Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 22 Morris St.
Dewey, A. Gordon, 712 Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Dickinson, Florence, Bryant High School, Long Island City, N. Y., 118-19 St. Jackson Height, Long Island, N. Y.
Diehl, Mrs. Frank, 2737 Maryland Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Dilks, Clara Gilbert, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6126 Jefferson St., West Philadelphia, Pa.
Donovan, Lillian, Supervisor of History and Civics, Junior High Schools, Department of Education, Madison and Lafayette Aves., Baltimore, Md., 2926 St. Paul St.
Dougherty, Philip, Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., 2 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park, Md.
Dowd, Mary A., Box 6, University Station, Syracuse, N. Y., 505 S. Crouse Ave.
Downey, Margaret E., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1575 Abbottston St.
Doyle, Anne, 3 Mitchell Place, New York, N. Y.
Doyle, John W., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 548-57 St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dragunas, William Joseph, John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York City, 343 Menahan St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dressner, Robert H., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, N. Y., 2710 Sedgwick Ave., Bronx, New York City.
Driscoll, Anna M., 415 W. 115 St., New York City.
Duggan, Stephen P., Director, Institute of International Education, College of the City of New York, New York City, 2 W. 45 St.
Dwyer, Mary M., South Side High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 638 Fifth Ave.
Earle, Edward Mead, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, 35 Claremont Ave.
Earle, Frances Elizabeth, Columbia University, New York City, Box 393, 1230 Amsterdam Ave.
Eckford, Mary Wright, 909 N. Tenth St., Columbia, Miss.
Eddy, Ruth M., Central Commercial and Manual Training High School, Newark, N. J., 35 Morris Place, Hillside, N. J.
Eddy, William Woodbridge, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 321 Cattell St
Ellery, Eloise, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Elliott, Charles H., Commissioner of Education of New Jersey, 330 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
Elliott, Rebecca Patton, Kensington High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 5031 Cedar Ave.
Elsbree, Oliver W., Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., 124 S. Fourth St.

Elson, Henry W., New York University, New York City,
1314 Watchung Ave., Plainfield, N. J.
Ely, Elizabeth L., Care Rye National Bank, Rye, Westchester County, N. Y.
Emery, Maude E., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 102 Milford Ave.
Emmons, Grace R., Willard Hall School, 8th & Adams St., Wilmington, Del.,
1222 Washington St.
Engelke, Mrs. Robert H., R. D. No. 2, Princeton, N. J.
Engle, Price B., Principal, Penn Treaty Senior High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
4699 Castor Road.
Enk, John C., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J.,
45 N. Seventh Ave., Highland Park.
Eshleman, Willis S., High School, West New York, N. J.,
111-33 St., Woodcliff, N. J.
Evans, Austin P., Columbia University, New York City, Montrose, N. Y.
Evans, Jessie Campbell, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
650 S. Highland Ave., Merion, Pa.
Evans, Sara F., (Mrs. H. C.), School No. 28, Wilmington, Del.,
709 Nottingham Road.
Fairchild, J. R., American Book Company, 88 Lexington Ave., New York City.
Falvey, Anna, High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 8629-106 St.
Farnsworth, Mildred A., Junior High School No. 64, Manhattan,
New York City, 47 Bowne Ave., Flushing, N. Y.
Farnsworth, Nellie M., Junior High School No. 64, Manhattan,
New York City, 47 Bowne Ave., Flushing, N. Y.
Farrell, Letitia, 401 W. 118th St.,New York City
Farrington, Charlotte Raynsford, Central High School, Washington, D. C.,
1623 Lanier Place, N. W.
Fay, Rev. Aloysius T., St. Joseph's College, Eighteenth and Thomson Sts.,
Philadelphia, Pa.
Fay, Harrison Gilbert, New York Training School for Teachers,
New York City, 111 W. 74 St.
Feick, Mildred C., High School, Randallstown, Md.,
4220 Hayward Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Fine, Harry B., Princeton Preparatory School, Princeton, N. J., 245 Nassau St.
Fleming, Carrie O., Julia Richman High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 450 E. 26 St.
Flick, Alexander Clarence, State Historian, University of the State of New
York, State Education Building, Albany, N.
Y., 127 S. Manning Blvd.
Fontaine, E. Clark, State Supervisor of High Schools, Maryland,
114 Water St., Chestertown, Md.
Foote, J. Wesley, Principal, John Barry Public School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
1615 S. 59 St.
Forman, S. E., 3600 Albemarle St., Washington, D. C.
Fortenbaugh, Robert, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., 150 Broadway.
Fox, Dixon Ryan, Columbia University, New York City, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Fox, Ida M., Smallwood School, Baltimore, Md., 2222 N. Calvert St.

Frank, Mary W., 1417 Newton St., Washington, D. C.
Franklin, Elma W., (Mrs. W. S.), State Normal School, Newark, N. J., 165 Franklin St., Bloomfield, N. J.
Freburger, Mary L., Gwynn's Falls Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1908 Park Ave.
Freeman, Sara H., High School, Englewood, N. J., 121 Huguenot Ave.
Frick, Mary G., (Mrs. W. H.), St. Agatha School, 559 West End Ave., New York City, 140 Overlook Ave., Great Neck, N. Y.
Furlong, Rev. Philip J., Cathedral College, New York City, 462 Madison Ave.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 548 Riverside Drive.
Gardner, Elizabeth, High School, Laurel, Md., 386 Mary St.
Gemmill, Charlotte E., Thomas Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1300 Spruce St.
Gerboth, H. B., Harcourt, Brace and Company, 383 Madison Ave., New York City.
Gibbons, Alice Newman, Director of Social Science Department, East High School, Rochester, N. Y., 1592 Highland Ave.
Gibson, Mary E., Adaire Public School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1104 E. Montgomery Ave.
Gilbert, Amy M., Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y.
Gillepsie, Olivia, Proof Reader, D. Appleton and Company, New York City, 9 Miles Ave., White Plains, N. Y.
Giltner, Emmett E., New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 85 Grant St., Yonkers, N. Y.
Gipson, Lawrence H., Lehigh University, Box 183, Bethlehem, Pa., Centre Valley, Pa.
Goldstone, Edwin G., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Golub, Jay, New Utrecht High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 127 Ellery St.
Goodman, Hannah, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1306 S. 53 St.
Goshow, Mildred, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 428 Conarroe St., Roxborough.
Gottschalk, Joseph M., Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5032 Cedar Ave.
Grady, Mrs. Eleanor Hunsdon, Hunter College, New York City, 222 E. 71 St.
Graham, William, North East, Md.
Gray, Nomer, 155 W. 65 St., New York City, 304 Chestnut St., Roselle Park, N. J.
Green, Joseph C., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 176 The Western Way.
Greenan, John T., High School, East Orange, N. J., 312 N. Walnut St.
Greene, Evarts Bontell, Columbia University, New York City, 35 Claremont Ave.
Greene, Garton S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Greene, W. Ainsworth, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.
Greer, Roxy R., Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y.,
106 W. Thirteenth St., New York City.
Gregg, G. F., Western High School, Washington, D. C., 1342 Quincy St., N. W.
Griffith, Helen Carolyn, 34 Westcolt St., East Orange, N. J.
Gross, Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City, 748 Jackson Ave.
Gwyder, Leona O'Conner, Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y.,
83-69 Charlecote Ridge.
Haasz, George Neiler, South Philadelphia High School for Boys,
Philadelphia, Pa., 1733 N. 25 St.
Hale, Harriet F., Morris High School, New York City,
166 St. and Boston Road.
Hamel, Margaret B., High School, Swarthmore, Pa., 112 Princeton Ave.
Hamilton, Ruth Gertrude, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Hanaway, Roy Clark, Wagner College, New York City,
21 Crescent Ave., St. George, Staten Island, N. Y.
Hanson, Daisy Evelyn, New York Training School for Teachers,
135th St., & St. Nicholas Terrace, New York City,
221 Egmont Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Harbold, Grace Ellen, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
1820 Columbia Ave.
Harden, Mary, State Normal School, New Haven, Conn.,
1002 Tenth St., Charleston, Ill.
Hartman, Mamie A., 206 Greenwich St., Kutztown, Pa.
Haslup, Alice E., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
121 Thirteenth St., N. E.
Hatch, Roy Winthrop, State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J.
Hayes, Carlton J. H., Columbia University, New York City, 427 W. 117 St.
Hayes, Edward Maurice, High School, Stroudsburg, Pa., 619 Main St.
Hayward, Clara Violet, Caldwell Junior High School, Upper Montclair, N. J.,
11 Garfield Place.
Hazen, Charles Downer, Columbia University, New York City, 42 E. 75 St.
Heald, Mark Mortimer, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.,
185 Moore St., Princeton, N. J.
Heckel, Albert Kerr, Dean of Men, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.,
7 Glenwood Ave.
Hendley, Charles James, George Washington High School, New York City,
W. 232 St. and Fairfield Ave.
Herrick, Cheesman Abiah, President, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hester, Mrs. Laura Pywell, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
Glencarlyn, Va.
Hickman, Emily, New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N. J.,
77 Nichol Ave.
Hill, Huntington, New York University, New York City
2015 University Ave., Apt. 4-D.

Hodgdon, Frederick Crosby, Member of Firm of Ginn and Company, Educational Publishers, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, 4 Gramercy Park.

Hodgdon, Mrs. Frederick Crosby, 4 Gramercy Park, New York City.

Hodgkins, George Wilson, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 1821 Kalorama Road.

Hollenbach, Charles R., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Holloway, Catherine Virginia, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 2707 Strathmore Ave., Hamilton.

Holt, Lucius Hudson, Colonel, United States Army, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Hood, Raymond J., Simon Gratz High School, Pnladelphia, Pa., 1321 Spruce St.

Horowitz, Max, Managing Director, Moeller Boarding School, Yonkers, N. Y., 87 Alta Ave.

Howard, Elizabeth I., School No. 89, Queens, Elmhurst, N. Y., 8605 Britton Ave.

Howe, Samuel Barnett, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 33 Lehigh Ave.

Hubbard, John T., High School, East Orange, N. J., 296 N. Walnut St.

Hughes, Roy Osgood, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, Pa., 5517 Beverly Place.

Hughes, Sara M., Vice Principal, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 7 Grandview Place.

Hull, Charles Henry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 413 E. Buffalo St.

Hull, William Isaac, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., 504 Walnut Lane.

Hussong, Hazel, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 603 Pearl St., Camden, N. J.

Huttman, Maude A., Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, 308 W. 73 St.

Hyatt, Alton Rufus, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Ironside, Charles Edward, 420 W. 119 St., New York City.

Isanogle, Alvey Michael, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md., Ridge Road at Westmoreland St.

Jacobs, Ethel A., West Side High School, Newark, N. J., 120 Linden Ave., Bloomfield, N. J.

Jarrold, Rachel M., Trenton State College and Normal School, Trenton, N. J., 514 E. State St.

Jenkins, Alice E., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 1513 Lafayette St.

Jewell, Marion D., 1400 Dean St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Johnson, Henry, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 35 Knollwood Ave., Mamaroneck Knolls, N. Y.

Johnson, Lloyd Wellington, Principal, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y., 75 Nassau Ave., Melverne, N. Y.

Johnston, Warren G., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 6917 Cottage St.

Jones, George J., Head Department of History, High Schools of Washington, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 3670 Park Place, N. W.

Jurkat, Frank Albert, Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio.

Kahn, Fannie, Gwynn's Falls Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., Marlborough Apts.

Kauffman, Rose M., Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4240 Pine St.

Kause, Selma, Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3018 Porter St., N. W.

Kaye, P. Lewis, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 3410 Pinkney Road.

Kayser, Elmer Louis, Director of Summer School, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 2031 F St.

Keffer, Mrs. Mary V., Westmont Upper-Yoder High School, Johnstown, Pa., 520 Franklin St.

Keliher, Alice Virginia, Student, Columbia University, New York City, Box 234, 1230 Amsterdam Ave.

Keller, Marie L., Haaren High School, New York City, 44 Woodruff Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Kelly, Frank B., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, Mosholu Parkway, Bronx.

Kelsey, Raynor W., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., 753 College Ave.

Kennedy, Edna Ruth, Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 57 Gardner Ave.

Kerpen, Otto, James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 857 N. Crotona Park.

Kimmel, W. G., Executive Secretary, Social Studies Investigation, 316 Library Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

King, Mrs. Florence B., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3622 Hamilton St.

Kinnear, Agnes I., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1750 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Kirk, Byron, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., Eagle Rock Ave., Roseland, N. J.

Kirkman, Loulie Redus, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 257 W. Eleventh St.

Klinesmith, Bessie, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 3913 Hawthorne Ave.

Knapp, Annie M., High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 8438-113 St.

Knee, Pauline, Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 4017 Pershing Drive, Clarendon, Va.

Kneeland, Edwin Leroy, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 33 Park Place.

Knowlton, Daniel C., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Knox, Antoinette, High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 13 Randolph Ave.

Koch, Flora M., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 309 W. 109 St., New York City.

Kochka, Mary M., (Mrs. J. L.), Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 2900 Connecticut Ave.

Kollock, Margaret R., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1926 Spring Garden St.
Krout, John A., Columbia University, New York City, 10 Fountain Inn.
Kuhn, Olga, New Utrecht High School, New York City, 3100 Broadway.
Kull, Irving Stoddard, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 203 Lincoln Ave.
Ladson, G. L., 1458 Columbia Road, Apt. 306, Washington, D. C.
LaFollette, Robert, Ball Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana, 921 W. Charles St.
Lamm, Lucian, Haaren High School, New York City, 2757 Claflin Ave., Bronx.
Lampert, Blanche L., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3427 Halstead Place, N. W.
Lamson, Elizabeth H., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1715 Kilbourne Place, N. W.
Lane, Layle, James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 226 W. 150 St.
Langford, A. M., Hightstown, N. J.
Langsam, Walter Consuelo, Columbia University, New York City, 63 W. 87 St.
Latané, Edith, St. Margaret's School, Tappahannock, Va.
Latané, John Holladay, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 210 Chancery Road, Roland Park.
Lavers, Lida A., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 42 Kearny St.
Lawrence, Antoinette, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., 25 McDonough St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lawrence, Mother Mary, Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.
Lawson, Leonard Axel, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 101 St. Clair St.
Leary, Marion Beall, 80 Center St., Oakland, Md.
Lee, Linette E., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 153 College Ave.
Lee, Mary Webb, 2712 Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Leete, Gertrude M., Dean of Girls, High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 9344 Hollis Court Blvd., Queen's Village, N. Y.
Leffler, Katherine, New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 36 W. 93 St.
Leffler, Mary Letitia, High School, Perryville, Md., Locust Lane, Elkton, Md.
Leiwerling, Gretta V., Junior High School, Trenton, N. J., 2333 S. Broad St.
Leonard, Caroline W., High School, Bayonne, N. J., 100 W. 33 St.
Lettinger, Leonard A., Supervising Principal, Willow Grove, Pa.
Levinson, Florence, Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 4025 Reisterstown Road.
Levy, Clara, State Normal School, Newark, N. J., 230 N. Sixth St.
Lewis, Ernest Dorman, Evander Childs High School, New York City, 120 E. 184 St.
Lewis, William Dodge, Editor-in-chief, The John C. Winston Company, 1006 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa., 38 E. Greenwood Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.

Lincoln, Anna T., Willard Hall School, Wilmington, Del., 721 Adams St.
Lindley, Charles A., College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lingelbach, William E., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lipsky, Leah, Seward Park High School, New York City.
Littell, Anna L., High School, Scotch Plains, N. J., Lock Box 144.
Lloyd, Amy G., David W. Harlan School, Wilmington, Del., Route 1, Box 137.
Lokke, Carl Ludwig, Furnald Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Lord, Eleanor L., Box 50, Rosemont, Pa.
Loreton, Joseph O., 46 Horatio St., New York City.
Loucks, Emerson H., State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 30 N. Washington, St.
Lucey, Anna M., Evander Childs High School, New York City, 34 Leighton Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Lunt, W. E., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Lynch, Jr., John H., 5845 Catherine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mace, William Harrison, Professor Emeritus and Author, 1125 Western Ave., Norfolk, Va.
Mackey, Sarah E., 717 Arlington Ave., Plainfield, N. J.
MacLear, Anne Bush, Hunter College, New York City, 118 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Manning, Frederick J., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Roberts Road, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Mansion, Frances A., Public School No. 89, Queens, New York City, 3345-82 St., Jackson Heights, N. Y.
Marsh, Genevieve, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 215 The Ontario.
Marshall, James F., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, N. Y., 2500 University Ave., Bronx, New York City.
Martin, Anna Kendall, George Washington High School, New York City, 650 W. 170 St.
Marty, Sara M., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 45 Edgewood Ave., Larchmont, N. Y.
Masland, Marion Woodworth, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1520 N. Fifteenth St.
Masterson, Rev. Peter V., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Matthews, Jr., William H., Columbia University, New York City, 600 W. 116 St.
McCarty, Cora, Business High School, Washington, D. C., 106 Hammond Court, Thirtieth and Q Sts., N. W.
McClain, Miriam, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
McClellan, Effie G., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 212 Pittston Ave.
McClintock, Anna S., 229 N. Linwood Ave., Baltimore, Md.
McClosky, Mary Lee, Chattle High School, Long Branch, N. J., 129 Norwood Ave.

McCreary, Gertrude R., High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 728 N. High St.
McCulloh, Margaret C., 446 S. Center St., Orange, N. J.
McGoldrick, Joseph D., Columbia University, New York City,
596 Madison St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
McGraw, E. Leona, Morris High School, New York City, 600 W. 146 St.
McGroarity, Mary Evangeline, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington,
D. C., Falls Church, Va.
McKee, Jr., Samuel, Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City,
211 Fort Washington Ave.
McKenzie, Isabel, Hunter College, New York City,
50 Curtis Place, Maplewood, N. J.
McKinley, Albert Edward, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.,
6901 Germantown Ave.
McMaster, Mrs. Virginia N., High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.
McMaster, William Edwin, High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.
McMurray, Donald LeCrone, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.,
210 McCartney St.
McNally, Lucille H., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
McQueen, Alice Edgerton, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia,
Pa., 6316 Sherman St., Germantown.
McQuilland, George T., Morris High School, New York City,
8501-94 St., Woodhaven, L. I., N. Y.
Mead, Nelson P., College of the City of New York ,New York City,
81 Hillside Ave., Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Melchoir, D. Montford, Supervisor of High School Instruction,
Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Meng, Mabel Anna, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
3767 N. Gratz St.
Merrill, George Abbott, High School, Hackensack, N. J., 124 Cedar Ave.
Miller, Jr., August Charles, The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.,
49 W. Brittania St., Taunton, Mass.
Miller, Helen, Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.
Miller, Margaret I., State Normal School and College, Trenton, N. J.,
50 Atterbury Ave.
Miller, Ralph W., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.,
R. F. D. No. 1, Kinzer, Pa.
Miller, Sarah L., (Mrs. Warren P.), Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia,
Pa., 4906 Knox St., Germantown.
Miner, Clarence E. W., Theodore Roosevelt High School, New York City,
921 St. Nicholas Ave.
Miner, Dwight Carroll, John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Mitchell, Pearl Boring, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
5016 Locust St.
Mohair, Anna B., Central High School, Newark, N. J.,
10 Summit St., East Orange, N. J.
Mohr, Walter Harrison, George School, Bucks County, Pa.

Monacella, Sister Mary, Villa Marie Collega, West Eighth St., Erie, Pa.
Monroe, Elsie Mae, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
154 Sharpnack St.
Moon, Parker Thomas, Columbia University, New York City,
29 Claremont Ave.
Moore, Emily E., North East, Md.
Moore, Olive, Teachers College, Columbia University, N. Y. C.
Morehouse, Frances, Hunter College, New York City, 414 W. 121 St.
Morley, Mrs. Caroline C., Shaw Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
1315 S. 53 St.
Morrissy, Elizabeth, Notre Dame College, Md., 3107 St. Paul St.
Morse, Livingston Burrill, College of the City of New York, New York City
400 W. 160 St.
Mosier, Elwood, Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., 325 E. 22 St.
Moyer, Fayette E., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City,
87 Grove St., Montclair, N. J.
Mudd, H. L., High School, Bayonne, N. J.,
107 W. Eleventh St., New York City.
Mueller, Henry R., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.,
230 W. Twentieth St.
Muhlfeld, Helen, Hunter College, New York City, 125 E. 164 St.
Munro, Dana Carlton, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Murphy, Joseph M., Columbia University, New York City, 2940 Broadway.
Murray, Lucy E., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2016 Park Ave.
Murray, Robert Cornelius, Senior Master, Riverdale Country School,
Riverdale-on-Hudson, N. Y., 2623 Sedgwick Ave.,
Kingsbridge, New York City.
Musser, John, Graduate School, New York University, New York City,
2087 Wiegand Place.
Muthard, William, High School, Coatesville, Pa., 600 E. Lincoln Highway.
Muzzey, David Saville, Columbia University, New York City,
492 Van Cortlandt Park Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Nelson, Mabel F., 115 W. Fifteenth St., New York City,
North Shore Hotel, Evanston, Ill.
Nettleton, Harriet A., Madison Junior High School, Newark, N. J.,
842 S. Fourteenth St.
Nicholas, Florence Louise, High School, Nazareth, Pa., 201 S. Whitefield St.
Nichols, Roy F., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 108 S. 36 St.
Norman, Mrs. Julia T., Principal, Severna Park School, Severna Park, Md.,
198 King George St., Annapolis, Md.
North, Lila V., High School, Montclair, N. J.,
178 Summit Ave., Upper Montclair, N. J.
North, Mary, High School, Montclair, N. J.,
4 Norman Road, Upper Montclair, N. J.
Norwood, J. Nelson, Dean, Alfred College, Alfred, N. Y.
Noyes, Edmund S., Central High School, Washington, D. C., Keasington, Md.

Nulle, S. H., College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Osgood, Ellen L., Coördinator, Julia Richman High School, New York City, Women's University Club, 106 E. 52 St.
Otis, Isaac L., Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., Jessup, Md.
Ott, Mary Castle, Hood College, Frederick, Md., 19 Rosemont Ave.
Packard, Frederick L., High School, Montclair, N. J., 34 Oakwood Ave., Upper Montclair, N. J.
Palmer, Earle Schuyler, High School, Montclair, N. J.
Palmer, Rilla Wood, East Side High School, Newark, N. J., Hotel East Orange, East Orange, N. J.
Park, Joseph H., New York University, New York City.
Park, Julian, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Niagara Square.
Parton Dorothy M., Central High School, Washington, D. C., 3926 Marian St., Chevy Chase, D. C.
Patch, Ralph S., High School, Plainfield, N. J., 829 Osborn Ave.
Patton, Mary Propert, School No. 3, Bronx, New York City, 83-27 St., Jackson Heights.
Peardon, Thomas Preston, Furnald Hall, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.
Peck, Beatrice, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 4922 Chancellor St.
Peckham, Beulah A., West Orange High School, West Orange, N. J., 40 S. Munn Ave., East Orange, N. J.
Penniman, Ralph Wentworth, Fosdick-Masten Park High School, Buffalo, N. Y., 29 Knowlton Ave., Kenmore.
Penny, Grace, Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C.
Phelan, W. B., Princeton Preparatory School, Princeton, N. J.
Phillips, Gladys Elizabeth, Principal, Elementary School, Hampstead, Md., 417 Maryland Ave., Cambridge, Md.
Phillips, Grace Ford, Elmer Ellsworth Junior High School, New York City, 125 S. Tenth Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Phillips, Jesse C., Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 718 S. 55 St.
Phinney, Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Associate Principal, The Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y., Pioneer St.
Pickett, Isabelle, Western High School, Washington, D. C., 2823-38 St., N. W.
Pielert, Mrs. Mabel A., Middle River, Baltimore County, Md.
Pitt, Ruth E., East High School, Buffalo, N. Y., 126 Pidwell Parkway.
Pius, Sister Mary, Mt. St. Agnes College., Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md.
Plate, Emma, Senior High School, Bayonne, N. J., 344 Highwood Ave., Leona, N. J.
Poole, Martha S., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Hammond Court.
Pratt, Julius W., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., 65 Evans St., Williamsville, N. Y.
Prentice, Leigh Wells, Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5006 N. Erringer Place, Germantown.

Price, Blanche D., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 404 W. School Lane.

Price, Joseph Haines, Germantown Friends' School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 7435 Sprague St., Mt. Airy.

Priest, W. Edwin, Western High School, Washington, D. C.

Puig, Louise M., Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1270 Carroll St.

Purcell, Richard T., Catholic University, Washington, D. C., 3202 Seventh St., N. E.

Quinlan, Grace M., Maxwell Training School for Teachers, Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., Park Place and Nostrand Ave.

Race, Marian N., High School, Passaic, N. J., 272 Lafayette Ave.

Raetzer, Ernest Y., Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 377 Hamilton Ave.

Ranck, James Byrne, Western Maryland College, Westminister, Md., 42 Longwell Ave.

Ranft, Charles F., Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., Sudbrook Park, Md.

Raubenheimer, Otto, 1341 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Raymond, Irving W., Columbia University, New York City, 404 W. 115 St.

Redmond, M. Lucy, 20 Madison St ., Annapolis, Md.

Reese, Lillian Berry, Lafayette Junior High School, No. 79, Baltimore, Md., 4103 Roland Ave.

Renninger, George Hansen, 317 E. Oakdale Ave., Glenside, Pa.

Renninger, Warren D., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rexford, Frank A., Director of Civics and Civic Activities, Board of Education, New York City, 445 Third St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rice, Irene, Western High School, Washington, D. C., 1645-31 St.

Rice, Winfield L., Boys High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 400 Clinton Ave.

Richardson, Mary Woods, South Side High School, Memphis, Tenn., 1020 Rayner St.

Rigney, Sister Regina, Mercedes College, Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson, New York City.

Risley, A. W., New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y., 455 State St.

Roberts, William Ely, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 207 McKinley Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.

Robinette, Rosalie A., Central High School, Washington, D. C., 111 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.

Robinson, George B., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., Livingston Apts.

Robinson, James H., 924 West End Ave., New York City.

Rogers, Elizabeth Frances, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

Rolar, Erma K., Shippensburg State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 204 E. Garfield St.

Rooney, Hugh C., Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 550 W. 157 St., New York City.

Roorbach, Agnew O., William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 1815 Whitehall St.

Roys, Abby Emery, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 2953 Boulevard.

Roys, Marion I., East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 22 Hillyer St., Orange, N. J.

Rugg, Harold, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 76 Riverside Drive.

Rust, Louise B., 252 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.

Ryan, Rev. Thomas F., Dean, St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y., 75 Lewis Ave.

Ryden, George Herbert, University of Delaware, Newark, Del., Box 334.

Sachs, Julius, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 225 W. 86 St.

Sackett, Hermon, State Teachers College of Edinboro, Edinboro, Pa.

Saurwalt, Alma Virginia, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 5415 N. Eleventh St.

Sayre, J. Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City, 3 Hawthorne Place, Montclair, N. J.

Schapiro, J. Salwyn, College of the City of New York, New York City, 254 W. Twelfth St.

Schlaerth, William J., Loyola College, Evergreen, Baltimore, Md.

Schmidt, Martha Virginia, High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., 1022 N. Fourth St.

Schulting, Emily E., High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 332 Gregory Ave., Passaic, N. J.

Schuyler, Livingston R., College of the City of New York, New York City, 520 W. 114 St.

Schuyler, Mary Eloise, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4922 Chancellor St.

Schwab, William K., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Schweppe, Emma, Director of Extension, State Normal School, Glassboro, N. J., 533 W. 124 St., New York City.

Scott, Helen A., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Scott, Pauline, Business High School, Washington, D. C., 2000 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Sebring, Emma G., Principal, St. Agatha's School, 553-559 West End Ave., New York City, 165 W. 82 St.

Selecter, Rachel, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Semmes, Raphael, Baltimore Club, Baltimore, Md.

Shafer, Mary Catherine, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pa., 111 N. Seventh St., Stroudsburg, Pa.

Shaffer, Louise, Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Md., 51 Main St.

Shaughnessy, Margaret, 1433 Bolton St., Baltimore, Md.

Shearer, Augustus H., Librarian, Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N. Y., 297 Linwood Ave.

Shefloe, Joseph S., The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City, 2314 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.

Sheldon, Laura C., 233 S. Fulton Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

Shepherd, William R., Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York City.

Shiels, Albert, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 515 W. 120 St.

Shipman, Henry Robinson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 27 Mercer St.

Shotwell, James Thomson, Columbia University, New York City, Director of Division of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 257 W. 86 St.

Shower, Cecilia M., Manchester, Md.

Shryock, Richard Harrison, Duke University, Durham, N. C., 375 Green Lane, Roxborough, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sigman, James G., Director of Visual Education, City Schools, Philadelphia, Pa., 3300 N. Bouvier St.

Silversmith, Mrs. Minnie B., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6033 Pine St.

Simpson, I. Jewell, Assistant State Superintendent of Schools, State Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md., The Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave.

Simpson, Sarah A., Junior High School No. 101, Manhattan, New York City, 401 W. 118 St.

Sioussat, St. George L., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Skidmore, Flossie, Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Md., 24 Depot Terrace.

Skinner, Avery W., Director of Examinations and Inspection Division, New York State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y., 180 Washington Ave.

Skinner, Mabel, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 303 Lexington Ave.

Smith, Donald E., George Washington High School, New York City, 3385 Sedgwick Ave.

Smith, Edward P., Supervisor of Social Studies, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.

Smith, Jennie R., Junior High School, Kenmore, N. Y., 169 Nassau Road, Buffalo, N. Y.

Smith, Margaret Virginia, High School, Plainfield, N. J., 113 Duer St.

Smith, Marie C., 60 Van Ness Place, Newark, N. J.

Smith, Sherman M., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 25 E. Pleasant St.

Smith, William Roy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 140 Radnor Road.

Snook, Margaret W., (Mrs. G. Alvin), Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4750 Penn St., Frankford.

Snowden, Sarah W., Newburgh High School, Newburgh, N. Y., 238 Montgomery St.

Spence, Lydia E., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 626 S. Paca St.

Spencer, Abraham Lincoln, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1824 Mt. Vernon St.

Staples, Blanche L., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 622 Bergen Ave.

Steele, Esther C. M., The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Steichen, Elizabeth, Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 233 Baldwin St.

Steinberg, Samuel, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

Stellwagon, George Heist, South Philadelphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 3736 Bonsall Ave.

Stern, Anna Louise, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., Sewell, N. J.

Stern, Bessie C., State Department of Education, 2014 Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md.

Stevenson, Helen G., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 279 Prospect Ave.

Stewart, Mary , Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1882 Columbia Road.

Stewart, Mary Weldon, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1218 S. Broad St.

St. John, Lois Barkley, Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 108 Hoffman Ave.

Stoloff, Mrs. Rose C., Seward Park High School, New York City.

Stolzenberg, Bessie, Seward Park High School, New York City, 4 E. 107 St.

Stough, Mulford, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 210 S. West St.

Strauss, Percival S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 6012 Morton St., Germantown.

Strayer, Minnie H., Hopkins Aps., 31st & St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.

Streeper, Amanda, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 632 N. Fortieth St.

Stryker, C. W., St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 98 College Ave.

Stryker, Florence E., State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J., 10 Roosevelt Place.

Stube, Charles Frederick, Columbia High School, South Orange, N. J., 66 Watson Ave., East Orange, N. J.

Stutz, Clara K., Western High School, Washington, D. C.

Stutz, Rose C., Western High School, Washington, D. C., Hammond Court.

Sullivan, James, Assistant Commissioner for Secondary Education, University of the State of New York, State Education Bldg., Albany, N.Y.

Sutch, Cleora, High School, Scarsdale, N. Y., Maple Lawn.

Suter, Carl William, High School, Leonia, N. J., 205 Crescent Ave.

Swain, James Edgar, Muhlenburg College, Allentown, Pa., 82 E. Stewart Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.

Sweeney, Edward A., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, N.Y., 4011 Eightieth St., Jackson Heights, N. Y.

Swetland, Roger Williams, Headmaster, The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.

Talbot, Ruth, High School, Ridgewood, N. J.

Talcott, Mabel Hall, Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Conn., 278 Washington St.
Tall, Lida Lee, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., Glen Esk.
Tanner, Edwin P., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., 210 Walnut Place.
Taylor, Hazel, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 68 Harvey St., Germantown.
Taylor, Jane I., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 5 W. 124 St.
Teakle, Thomas, Lewis and Clark High School, Spokane, Wash., W. 1508 Ninth Ave.
Tenrosen, Daniel, Julia Richman High School, New York City, 672 Linden Blvd., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Textor, Lucy Elizabeth, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomas, Bernadotte, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., 77 W. Stratford Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Thompson, Eleanor, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 2020 N. 21 St.
Thompson, James Arthur, Singerly School, Philadelphia, Pa., 669 Brooklyn St.
Thompson, Mrs. M. Berna Hunt, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 196 Clinton Ave.
Thönssen, Ruby E., Gordon Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3834 Garfield St.
Tibbitts, C. H., High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 7 Grubb St.
Tieman, Elsie C., Care of Morgan and Company, 14 Place Vendôme, Paris, France.
Toner, Caroline E., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1814 Ingleside Terrace, N. W.
Townsend, Caroline May, High School, Towson, Md., 3312 Westerwald Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Townsend, Mary Evelyn, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 300 W. 109 St.
Trimble, Helen Bell, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pa.
Tucker, Bethania, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 30 Kensington Ave.
Twaddell, Helen, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3620 Hamilton St.
Underhill, Carolyn A., Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., Overbrook Court, Overbrook.
Valentine, Katherine, Junior High School No. 47, Baltimore, Md., 1120 N. Calvert St.
Van Bibber, Lena Chew, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., The Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Van Dyke, Paul, The Graduate College, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Van Sant, Sarah, Junior High School No. 91, Baltimore, Md., 3009 Clifton Ave.

Van Vlect, George W., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1462 Glenwood Road.

Varley, Elsie D., Ossining School for Girls, Ossining, N. Y.

Vincent, John Martin, Professor Emeritus, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 313 Forest Road, Roland Park.

Viet, Andrew M., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 524 Alexandria Ave., Clarendon, Va.

Wagner, Hardesty Emory, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 46 Park Place, Audubon, N. J.

Waidlich, Luther F., Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 360 N. Main St., Sellersville, Pa.

Waldo, Virginia, Miss Hockaday's School, Dallas, Texas.

Walter, Ella C., Senior High School, Johnstown, Pa., 520 Franklin St.

Walther, E. Curt, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 715 Evesham Ave.

Walton, George A., Principal, George School, Bucks County, Pa.

Wanger, Ruth, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 833 W. Marshall St., Norristown, Pa.

Ware, Caroline F., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 108 Raymond Ave.

Warren, Mrs. Florence L., 412 E. Fourth St., Wilmington, Del.

Waters, Suzanne Beatrice, Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C. 3300 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Weglein, David E., Superintendent of Schools, Madison and Lafayette Aves., Baltimore, Md., 2400 Linden Ave.

Weidenhammer, M. Antoinette, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 213 S. Calhoun St.

Weigle, C. Lee, High School, West Orange, N. J., 106 Elm St., Orange, N. J.

Weisenburg, Anna I., 538 Seneca St., Bethlehem, Pa.

Wells, Laura M., Supervisor, Intermediate Grades, Department of Education, Baltimore, Md., 4607 Edmondson Ave.

Wells, Mary B., Hartridge School, Plainfield, N. J., 1130 Thornton Ave.

Wendel, Hugo C. M., Long Island University, Brooklyn, N. Y., 401 Eighth Ave.

West, Ruth, Lewis & Clark High School, Spokane, Washington, 1207 W. Seventh Ave.

Westermann, William Linn, Columbia University, New York City, 23 Donellan Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Westfall, Ralph Raymond, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 8624 Ridge Blvd.

White, Fred C., Morris High School, New York City, 470 E. 161 St.

White, Helen D., Germantown Friends' School, Philadelphia, Pa., 171 E. Walnut Lane, Germantown.

Whitney, Cornelia, J. O. Wilson Normal School, Washington, D. C., 672 Maryland Ave., N. E.

Wiener, Katherine Marie, High School, Frederick, Md., 109 E. Patrick St.

Wilcox, Horace N., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 136 Hicks St.
Wilder, Charles W., Headmaster, The Arnold School, Pittsburgh, Pa., 7505 Rosemary St.
Wildes, Harry Emerson, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Malvern, Pa.
Wildes, Mrs. Helen J., Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Malvern, Pa.
Wildman, Catherine, High School, Langhorne, Pa., 303 N. Pine St.
Wildman, Esther Theresa, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 140 N. Fifteenth St.
Wildman, Nathan, 2730 W. York St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Wilkenson, Katherine May, Miss Chapin's School, 32 E. 57 St., New York City, 41 Central Park, West.
Williamson, Mrs. Louise S., Wilson Ave. School, Newark, N. J., 615 Bangs Ave., Asbury Park, N. J.
Willis, Margaret, Constantinople Woman's College, Galata P. O., Box 39. Constantinople, Turkey.
Wilson, Ida Belle, Maryland State Normal School, Salisbury, Md.
Wilson, Martin L., James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 217 Third St., Ridgefield Park, N. J.
Wing, Lucy Madeira, (Mrs. David L.) Headmistress, Miss Madeira's School, 1330 Nineteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Winston, Adele W., Morris High School, New York City, 3647 Broadway.
Winters, Herbert D. Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.
Witmer, M. Eleta, Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., Barclay Court, S. Pennsylvania Ave.
Wlodeck, Alwina H., Walton High School, New York City, 953 Anderson Ave.
Wolf, Morris, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 47 Sunshine Road, Upper Darby, Delaware County, Pa.
Wolff, Mabel P., The Summit School, St. Paul, Minn., 1248 Lincoln Ave.
Wombaugh, Jennie R., High School, Olean, N. Y., 215 N. First St.
Wood, Della E., Radnor High School, Wayne, Pa., 5416 Sansom St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Wood, Elizabeth C., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 100 Morningside Drive.
Wood, Laura, L., Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y., 432 Buffalo Ave., Paterson, N. J.
Woodward, Esther Rittenhouse, Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 125 New York Ave., N. W.
Woodworth, Allegra, The Shipley School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1106 County Line Road.
Woodworth, Carlos Anderson, Principal, High School, West New York, N. J., 24 Monitor Place.
Worstell, Helen S., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

Wyckoff, Harriet Elvira, High School of Commerce, New York City,
512 W. 123 St.
Xavier, Sister Mary, Mt. St. Agnes College, Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md.
Young, Helen L., Hunter College, New York City,
30 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Young, Julia A., Grover Cleveland School, Washington, D. C.,
1911 Third St., N. W.
Zema, Demetrius B., Graduate School, Fordham University,
Bronx, New York City.